

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

P.R.  
ST3  
X



RECEIVED  
JUN 22 1960  
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

# Bulletin

JUN 13 1960

Vol. XLII, No. 1091

May 23, 1960

**UNITED STATES PLANE DOWNED IN SOVIET UNION**

<i>Statement by Secretary Herter, May 9</i> . . . . .	816
<i>NASA and Department Statements, May 3-7</i> . . . . .	817
<i>U.S. Note of May 6</i> . . . . .	818

**MUTUAL SECURITY, ITS PRINCIPLE AND PROGRAMS • Address by President Eisenhower** . . . . .

811

**PRESIDENT URGES CONGRESS TO ACT ON MUTUAL SECURITY LEGISLATION • Excerpt From**

<i>President's Message of May 3</i> . . . . .	837
---	-----

**NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL HOLDS MINISTERIAL MEETING AT ISTANBUL** . . . . .

839

**DISARMAMENT: THE PROBLEM AND THE PROSPECTS • by Assistant Secretary Wilcox** . . . . .

820

**UNITED STATES AND NEPAL AFFIRM MUTUAL DESIRE TO WORK FOR WORLD ORDER BASED ON INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE** . . . . .

827

**VIEWS ON FREEDOM-OF-NAVIGATION AMENDMENT TO MUTUAL SECURITY ACT • Letter of**

<i>Acting Secretary Dillon to Senator Fulbright</i> . . . . .	832
---	-----

*For index see inside back cover*

THE  
OFFICIAL  
WEEKLY RECORD  
OF  
UNITED STATES  
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

# Bulletin

VOL. XLII, No. 1091 • PUBLICATION 6999

May 23, 1960

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Office of Public Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.*

*Publications of the Department, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are listed currently.*

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents  
U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:  
\$2 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25  
Single copy, 25 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 20, 1958).

**Note:** Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

## Mutual Security, Its Principle and Programs

*Address by President Eisenhower<sup>1</sup>*

Before I convey to you the thoughts that I have put down on paper for this purpose this evening, I want to give a word of explanation about my understanding about this meeting.

The invitation that I received requested that I add my voice to those who support the Mutual Security Program of the United States and cooperation among the free nations of the world. There was not a word said about any function honoring me, and I heard no such talk from either the cochairman or any of my staff. So I want to take this moment to thank my friends from so many countries who have paid to me over-generous and possibly undeserved compliments.

I want to say to them something that they already know—and I am sure you do—that the greetings that I received from so many places in Europe and Asia<sup>2</sup> were simply one thing: The effort of great peoples to tell the people of the United States of their respect for them, their admiration, and their affection. I was the messenger, and if I were a successful messenger in that office, in bringing that feeling from these countries to my own, then I am indeed happy and proud. In any event I thank you all for your compliments.

This gathering heartens every true believer in preparedness, freedom, and peace. That leaders from all across the land would assemble here—

<sup>1</sup> Made before the Committee for International Economic Growth and the Committee To Strengthen the Frontiers of Freedom, at Washington, D.C., on May 2 (White House press release; as-delivered text).

<sup>2</sup> President Eisenhower made an 11-nation trip to Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, and Africa Dec. 3-22, 1959; for background, see *BULLETIN* of Jan. 11, 1960, p. 46.

energetically to reaffirm support of mutual security—is good news indeed. This rededication could not come at a better time. For trends are developing—particularly in Washington—that are profoundly disturbing.

### Support and Understanding of Program

Unless an alert citizenry takes effective action to support those in the Congress who champion the cause of mutual security, it could well result:

In jeopardizing an important part of the Nation's defense;

In endangering our worldwide alliance structure;

And in weakening efforts to resist Communist expansion and to forge a just peace.

Two months ago I requested the Congress to continue adequate support of our long-proven Mutual Security Program.<sup>3</sup> I asked an appropriation of \$4.175 billion—a sum one-twentieth of our Federal budget and one-tenth of our defense budget. This amount is imperatively required. The Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff all share this conviction.

One bright development is that, in the past few days, the committees of Congress legislatively concerned with our relations with other nations have reasserted the overriding importance of our Mutual Security Program to America's security and free-world progress. Only this evening I have been informed by Senators [J. W.] Fulbright

<sup>3</sup> For text of the President's message to Congress, together with statements by Secretary Herter and Under Secretary Dillon, see *ibid.*, Mar. 7, 1960, p. 369.

and [Everett M.] Dirksen that the Senate this evening [May 2] acted constructively on this program in the authorizing legislation. The same has of course happened in the House.

But, at the same time, other groups strategically situated in Congress have proclaimed it as their fixed purpose to slash the appropriation for this mainstay of the free world by more than a billion dollars. They cite isolated instances of malfunctioning in operational staffs as an excuse to attack a great program, which for 14 years has been indispensable in protecting America's stake in security, in free-world cooperation, and in global peace. On such grounds and on the erroneous contention that our Mutual Security Program is ineffectual, they would reduce it by 25 percent or more.

Every American citizen needs to understand what this would mean.

It would be, for America and all the free world, a crushing defeat in today's struggle between communistic imperialism and a freedom founded in faith and justice.

It would mean, within a matter of months, new international tensions and new international problems of the utmost gravity for every one of our citizens.

It would mean the virtual abandonment of an effort which has yielded our Nation greater benefits in security, better neighbors, and opportunities for expansion of profitable trade than has been achieved by any comparable expenditures for any other Federal purpose.

An America aroused can prevent these calamitous results, for in this Republic government must respond to the will of the people.

Mutual security has never been, nor is it now, Republican or Democratic. Like our own defense program, of which it is an essential part, it is bipartisan to the core. This program was started 14 years ago by my Democratic predecessor. It was first enacted into law by the Republican 80th Congress. Both political parties, patriotically joined in the national interest, are its parents. And still today both parties are pledged to its support.

Here, specifically, are solemn promises made to the American people in the public document:

First, "... we strongly favor collective defense arrangements. . . ."

Second, "we believe that . . . America must

support the efforts of underdeveloped countries. . . ."

Third, "... we will intensify our cooperation with our neighboring republics. . . ."

Here is another set of pledges:

First, "we shall continue to support the collective security system. . . ."

Second, "where needed, we shall help friendly countries maintain such local forces and economic strength as provide a first bulwark against Communist aggression or subversion."

Third, "we will continue efforts with friends and allies to assist the underdeveloped areas of the free world. . . ."

Now in their meaning, these two sets of pledges are identical. The first three are in the Democratic platform of 1956. The last three are in the Republican platform of the same year. These commitments still stand. America has the right to expect both parties to keep their word.

#### **Achievements of Mutual Security**

Indeed, even beyond the call of integrity, both parties have excellent reason to do so. For mutual security has effectively supported freedom everywhere on earth. It has made possible a greater and mutually advantageous trade. No other investment has yielded greater dividends in terms of stability, security, and free-world morale.

This is the program that helped to save Greece from Communist guerrillas. It helped to rescue Turkey from economic collapse, restoring this critical area as a bastion of freedom. It helped to maintain Western Europe as a center of free—rather than Communist—power and production. The importance of these victories is incalculable; every one of our citizens is today the stronger, the more prosperous, the more secure, thanks to mutual security.

In Asia, under SEATO [Southeast Asia Treaty Organization] and other security treaties, a million soldiers stand as a bulwark of liberty—sustained, again, by mutual security.

As I speak tonight, our economic and military help gives support to the military might of 42 other nations, which stand poised in freedom's cause. For this they—and we—give heartfelt thanks to mutual security.

On five continents our economic and technical programs help struggling millions better their



production and living standards. Only recently I looked into the faces of these many people. I have seen the desperate need of these people; I have felt their spirit. Most of all, I have witnessed their abiding faith in the greatness and goodness of America, and their love and respect for this land of the free. By helping to make their lives more meaningful and more rewarding, we have helped to keep bright their love of liberty and their determination to reject the soulless forces of Communist materialism.

Moreover, America's efforts to help others have evoked a heartening response from other advanced industrial nations. In recent years they have doubled their direct aid to the less developed countries. In addition, in the new International Development Association other countries will put up \$3 for every \$2 put up by the United States. The very moment when other countries are recognizing their responsibilities is no time for us to walk away from our own.

That such a program—its record shining with accomplishment and its continuance solemnly pledged by both of our political parties—should now face a crippling cutback seems incredibly irresponsible. To me it is almost inconceivable.

Let America speak, and this will not be done.

### **The Unfinished Task**

Thus far I have mentioned past achievements. But a great deal more cries out for attention.

Half a world away from us, for example, a great democracy, dedicated to peace, struggles with almost insuperable problems to demonstrate that Asians do not have to sacrifice freedom as payment for economic advance.

To the south our sister Republics need help to unlock the storehouses of their great wealth.

In Africa a seething continent is trying to telescope a thousand years of development into a few decades.

Around the world almost 2 billion people are living in a ferment of privation, misery, resentment, and frustrated hope. They are imbued with an unshakable, even fanatical, determination to break through the spiritual and cultural stagnation imposed upon them by grinding poverty.

Mutual security has done much to help. The hope, confidence, and energetic effort so inspired are slowly making progress in creating conditions in which prosperity, security, and peace in free-

dom can flourish. But for lack of understanding the program has been steadily weakened while the need has grown more obvious and critical. Only the conscience and the down-to-earth commonsense of all Americans, informed and aroused, can meet the need.

Facing us is a test of our resolve to make our Government do the task it has to do to protect the safety of the American people. The amount I have asked the Congress to provide for mutual security is the minimum required to meet the basic necessities of sheer defense and to keep alight a glimmer of hope in hundreds of millions of people arrayed with us on the side of freedom.

### **America Needs the World**

From all these facts we see that the free world needs America! Just as importantly, America needs the world.

This means far more to us than soldiers and tanks and ships and missiles, essential though these are. Important it is that our allies contribute 5 million soldiers, 30,000 airplanes, and 2,200 combatant ships to the common defense of freedom. But our involvement with our neighbors is far more basic than this.

Foreign trade is an example. It is, for America, a \$30 billion a year business. To this trade 4½ million of our people owe their jobs with other nations.

For all of us there is great meaning in this: We export, on the average, a third of our cotton crop, just under a third of our wheat, and a fourth of our tractor production.

But this is only a part of our dependence on foreign trade. The health of our economy depends upon materials owned by others. Manganese, chrome, tin, natural rubber, nickel are examples. As our economy grows, we depend increasingly upon others for such materials. Eight years ago we imported only about a twentieth of our iron ore. Today we have to import over a third of it.

Yes, America needs the world!

And this we must never forget: These needs are more than military and economic. They are technical, cultural, and spiritual as well. Great ideas originating with other peoples have vastly enriched our land.

Fellow Americans, even if we wanted to, we could not shut out the free world. We cannot

escape its troubles. We cannot turn our backs on its hopes. We are an inseparable part of the free-world neighborhood.

We must hold to these truths:

If nations friendly to us are weakened and imperiled, so are we.

If other friendly nations are strong and free, our own strength and freedom are more secure.

If other free nations prosper, so do we.

In these truths we see the fallacy of adding measurably to our own massive and adequate armaments at the expense of allied strength, which is in many instances better located strategically than ours can ever be. No less dangerous is the annual argument that America should stint on strengthening the free world because this would give us more luxury in a comfortable isolation here at home.

This is sheer deadliness—a counsel of defeat and complacency. Logically carried out, it could end only in a militarized America. To the extent that this concept is indulged it gravely menaces the people of the United States.

We can, here at home, arm to the teeth and yet go down in total defeat if we let the rest of the world be swallowed up by an atheistic imperialism. By abandonment of struggling millions to lives of hopeless desperation, rich America might, for a time, live more extravagantly. But not for long! For a just peace, dependable security, and real progress were never bought by destructive weapons and hardhearted selfishness, but rather by education, by training, by constructive works—by cooperation.

Only by thinking of ourselves, and truly conducting ourselves, as brothers under God with those who, with us, want to live and grow in freedom, can we hope to solve problems in which failure will mean disaster for much of humanity. Victory in this effort will mean a shoulder-to-shoulder march to greater security, greater prosperity, and greater happiness for all. There, in those few words, is the very heart of mutual security.

So tonight I restate to you this pledge of the executive branch of your Government. I pledge a continuing and energetic support of the principle and programs of mutual security. And I call upon the leadership and the rank and file of both political parties, as well as upon all other sons and daughters of America, to see that those

parties hold true to their pledges to give this program their support.

Of this I am certain: The path for America must be one of cooperation—cooperation among ourselves and with our friends abroad who are dedicated to human dignity and from whom we draw strength as we impart of our own strength to them. Together we shall confidently carry the burdens and sacrifices of sustaining security against any imperialistic design—as together we continue the search for peace, a search in which we shall persevere without tiring or ceasing until victory, at last, shall belong to all the earth.

Thank you and good night.

## Mutual Security Report Emphasizes Problems of Economic Development

Press release 235 dated May 2

The United States will face "new and somewhat different problems in the mutual security area" during the decade of the 1960's, according to President Eisenhower's semiannual report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program, transmitted on May 2.<sup>1</sup>

The report declared that the growing realization of hundreds of millions of people in underdeveloped countries that hunger, poverty, and disease need not be their inevitable lot "represents an emerging force which will probably become the most significant single social factor" of the new decade. "This mighty surging movement in the underdeveloped countries seldom makes for headlines and so far rarely for international 'incidents,'" the report added. "Yet its implications for the decade we are now in are tremendous. . . ."

The report stated the problems and opportunities inherent in the beginning of economic development in the emergent countries have been the subject of "searching thought" both in the United States and in Western Europe in recent months. "Our friends and allies in Europe are also aware of this need, and as their ability to provide development assistance grows, we are increasingly consulting with them to determine how the burden

<sup>1</sup> Report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program for the First Half of Fiscal Year 1960; available upon request from the Office of Public Services, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

can most efficiently be shared by all," declared President Eisenhower's letter transmitting the report to Congress.

The report declared it has become increasingly clear that the Western industrial nations must make available to the less developed countries the knowledge, advice, and capital to allow economic development within the framework of a free society. The report added:

If they do not do so, the political and economic influence of the Communist system will be firmly established over whole continents, where the fateful first steps of political and economic development are now being taken. . . .

It behooves the Western democracies to demonstrate by their aid and encouragement that economic advancement can be achieved without putting on the straitjacket of political and economic tyranny.

Reporting on mutual security activities during the semiannual period by areas, the report noted these developments:

*Europe.* Economic aid virtually terminated, with only Spain, Yugoslavia, Iceland, and Berlin left as recipients. On the military side there was a significant increase in defense expenditures of our NATO partners, reflecting increasing economic stability and prosperity of Europe.

*Africa.* Most pressing needs of new nations of Africa are, first, administrative, managerial, and technical skills, and, second, capital for development projects. A significant development in this area during the period was an increase in Soviet bloc activity, evidenced by acceptance of a \$110 million line of credit by Ethiopia from the bloc and by a \$35 million U.S.S.R. loan to Guinea.

*Near East and South Asia.* The Near East enjoyed a period of relative calm. A significant development in South Asia was announcement of agreement in principle between India and Pakistan on a plan to divide the waters of the Indus River system.<sup>2</sup>

*Far East.* Largest allocations of fiscal year 1960 appropriations were made, as in the past, to the three divided countries—Korea, Viet-Nam, and the Republic of China—which must maintain large defense forces and are consequently in the greatest need of U.S. assistance. Flood relief programs were undertaken in Taiwan, Korea, and Japan.

Citing other activities of the Mutual Security Program during the period, the report listed De-

<sup>2</sup> For background, see BULLETIN of Mar. 21, 1960, p. 442.

velopment Loan Fund loans totaling \$172.2 million in 17 countries. In addition DLF negotiated 22 loan agreements in the amount of \$130 million which represented earlier loan approvals. This activity brought the value of loan commitments issued by DLF since its inception to \$908.8 million. All of the loans made for industrial projects were made to private borrowers, including a chemical and pesticide plant in Turkey, pulp and paper and cement plants in the Philippines, and phosphate mines in Jordan.

A total of \$32 million in special assistance funds was allocated for U.S. participation in the worldwide malaria eradication program.

As a part of the Government's overall plan in this field, the International Cooperation Administration continued to encourage private enterprise to participate more fully in economic development programs in Thailand, the Sudan, Jordan, Israel, India, Taiwan, Nepal, Ceylon, Ghana, and Greece.

The report said the Mutual Security Program played no part in increases in the balance-of-payments deficits of 1958 and 1959, pointing out, while there had been some increases in offshore procurement under nonmilitary programs, these increases were offset by decreases in offshore procurement under military programs. Although MSP did not cause the increase in balance-of-payments deficits, the report pointed to a new DLF procurement policy which could contribute to a reduction in the balance-of-payments deficit. The new DLF policy places primary emphasis on financing of goods and services of U.S. origin in procurement for DLF projects.<sup>3</sup>

## Inter-American Advisory Committee Holds Fourth Meeting

The Department of State announced on May 5 (press release 247) that the National Advisory Committee on Inter-American Affairs is meeting at the Department on May 6 and 7. Following his return to Washington Secretary Herter will participate in the meeting of the Committee on May 7.

This will be the fourth meeting of the Committee since its creation by President Eisenhower on November 14, 1959.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of the Commit-

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, Nov. 16, 1959, p. 708.

<sup>2</sup> For background, see BULLETIN of Dec. 7, 1959, p. 823, and Dec. 21, 1959, p. 904.

tee is to consider, on a continuing basis, current and long-range problems of our relations with Latin America and to make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of State. The members of the Committee accompanied President Eisenhower on his trip to South America<sup>2</sup> earlier this year, and part of the current meeting will be devoted to a review and assessment of the results of that trip.

## United States Plane Downed in Soviet Union

*Following is a series of statements and the text of a U.S. note on the subject of a U.S. plane alleged to have been shot down over the Soviet Union on May 1.*

### STATEMENT BY SECRETARY HERTER, MAY 9

Press release 254 dated May 9

On May 7 the Department of State spokesman made a statement with respect to the alleged shooting down of an unarmed American civilian aircraft of the U-2 type over the Soviet Union. The following supplements and clarifies this statement as respects the position of the United States Government.

Ever since Marshal Stalin shifted the policy of the Soviet Union from wartime cooperation to postwar conflict in 1946 and particularly since the Berlin blockade, the forceful takeover of Czechoslovakia, and the Communist aggressions in Korea and Viet-Nam the world has lived in a state of apprehension with respect to Soviet intentions. The Soviet leaders have almost complete access to the open societies of the free world and supplement this with vast espionage networks. However, they keep their own society tightly closed and rigorously controlled. With the development of modern weapons carrying tremendously destructive nuclear warheads, the threat of surprise attack and aggression presents a constant danger. This menace is enhanced by the threats of mass destruction frequently voiced by the Soviet leadership.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Mar. 28, 1960, p. 471.

For many years the United States in company with its allies has sought to lessen or even to eliminate this threat from the life of man so that he can go about his peaceful business without fear. Many proposals to this end have been put up to the Soviet Union. The President's open-skies proposal of 1955 was followed in 1957 by the offer of an exchange of ground observers between agreed military installations in the U.S., the U.S.S.R., and other nations that might wish to participate. For several years we have been seeking the mutual abolition of the restrictions on travel imposed by the Soviet Union and those which the United States felt obliged to institute on a reciprocal basis. More recently at the Geneva disarmament conference the United States has proposed far-reaching new measures of controlled disarmament. It is possible that the Soviet leaders have a different version and that, however unjustifiedly, they fear attack from the West. But this is hard to reconcile with their continual rejection of our repeated proposals for effective measures against surprise attack and for effective inspection of disarmament measures.

I will say frankly that it is unacceptable that the Soviet political system should be given an opportunity to make secret preparations to face the free world with the choice of abject surrender or nuclear destruction. The Government of the United States would be derelict to its responsibility not only to the American people but to free peoples everywhere if it did not, in the absence of Soviet cooperation, take such measures as are possible unilaterally to lessen and to overcome this danger of surprise attack. In fact the United States has not and does not shirk this responsibility.

In accordance with the National Security Act of 1947, the President has put into effect since the beginning of his administration directives to gather by every possible means the information required to protect the United States and the free world against surprise attack and to enable them to make effective preparations for their defense. Under these directives programs have been developed and put into operation which have included extensive aerial surveillance by unarmed civilian aircraft, normally of a peripheral character but on occasion by penetration. Specific missions of these unarmed civilian aircraft have



not been subject to Presidential authorization. The fact that such surveillance was taking place has apparently not been a secret to the Soviet leadership, and the question indeed arises as to why at this particular juncture they should seek to exploit the present incident as a propaganda battle in the cold war.

This Government had sincerely hoped and continues to hope that in the coming meeting of the Heads of Government in Paris Chairman Khrushchev would be prepared to cooperate in agreeing to effective measures which would remove this fear of sudden mass destruction from the minds of peoples everywhere. Far from being damaging to the forthcoming meeting in Paris, this incident should serve to underline the importance to the world of an earnest attempt there to achieve agreed and effective safeguards against surprise attack and aggression.

At my request and with the authority of the President, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Honorable Allen W. Dulles, is today briefing Members of the Congress fully along the foregoing lines.

#### **STATEMENTS BY NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION**

##### **Statement of May 3<sup>1</sup>**

A NASA U-2 research airplane, being flown in Turkey on a joint NASA-USAF Air Weather Service mission, apparently went down in the Lake Van, Turkey, area at about 9:00 a.m. (3:00 a.m. e.d.t.) Sunday, May 1.

During the flight in southeast Turkey, the pilot reported over the emergency frequency that he was experiencing oxygen difficulties. The flight originated in Adana with a mission to obtain data on clear air turbulence.

A search is now underway in the Lake Van area.

The pilot is an employee of Lockheed Aircraft under contract to NASA.

The U-2 program was initiated by NASA in 1956 as a method of making high-altitude weather studies.

##### **Statement of May 5<sup>2</sup>**

One of NASA's U-2 research airplanes, in use since 1956 in a continuing program to study gust-meteorological conditions found at high altitude, has been missing since about 9 o'clock Sunday morning (local time) when

<sup>1</sup> Made orally in response to press inquiries on May 3.

<sup>2</sup> Released to the press on May 5.

its pilot reported he was having oxygen difficulties over the Lake Van, Turkey, area.

The airplane had taken off from Incirlik Air Base, Turkey. The flight plan called for the first check point to be at 37 degrees, 25 minutes, North: 41 degrees, 23 minutes, East, and for a left turn to be made to the Lake Van beacon, thence to the Trabazon beacon, thence to Antalya, and return to Adana. The flight scheduled was estimated at 3 hours, 45 minutes, for a total of 1,400 nautical miles. Takeoff was at 8 a.m. local time.

(The above-given times are the equivalent of 3 a.m. Sunday, and 2 a.m., Eastern Daylight Time.)

About one hour after takeoff, the pilot reported difficulties with his oxygen equipment. Using emergency radio frequency, he reported he was heading for the Lake Van beacon to get his bearings, and that he would return to Adana.

As indicated above, his flight plan called for him to make a left turn at the Lake Van beacon. His last report indicated he was attempting to receive that beacon. It is believed he probably was on a northeasterly course, but there was no further word.

An aerial search was begun soon after receipt of the last communication. The Lake Van area is mountainous and very rugged. No evidence has been sighted of the aircraft having crashed.

If the pilot continued to suffer lack of oxygen, the path of the airplane from the last reported position would be impossible to determine. If the airplane was on automatic pilot, it is likely it would have continued along its north-easterly course.

The pilot, as are all pilots used on NASA's program of upper atmosphere research with the U-2 airplane, is a civilian employed by the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, builders of the airplane.

When the research program was begun in 1956 by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (Predecessor to NASA), the federal agency did not have a sufficient number of pilots to operate the program, and so a contract was made with Lockheed to provide the pilots.

Overseas logistic support for NASA's continuing use of the U-2 is provided by Air Weather Service units of the USAF.

NASA has procured a total of 10 U-2 airplanes. The airplane was originally built as a private venture by Lockheed to serve as a "flying test bed". It is powered by a single Pratt & Whitney J-57 turbojet engine, and can maintain flight for as long as four hours at altitudes of up to 55,000 feet.

Since inception of the research program in 1956, the U-2 flying weather laboratories have operated from bases in California, New York, Alaska, England, Germany, Turkey, Pakistan, Japan, Okinawa and the Philippines.

The U-2 airplanes are presently being used in California (Edwards AFB, one), Japan (Atsugi, three) and Turkey (Adana, four).

The instrumentation carried by the U-2 permits obtaining more precise information about clear air turbulence, convective clouds, wind shear, the jet stream, and such widespread weather patterns as typhoons. The air-



plane also has been used by NASA to obtain information about cosmic rays, and the concentration of certain elements in the atmosphere, including ozone and water vapor.

Instrumentation carried includes: Angular velocity recorder, to measure the airplane's rate of pitch; modified VGH recorder, to measure and record head-on gust components in flight; flight recorder Model BB, continuous recorder of indicated airspeed, pressure altitude and normal acceleration; airspeed and altitude transducer to measure pressure altitude and indicated airspeed; temperature and humidity measuring set AN/AMQ 7, to measure indicated free air temperature and indicated relative humidity; and vortex thermometer system, to measure true free-air temperature within one-half degree Centigrade at high speeds.

#### DEPARTMENT STATEMENT, MAY 5<sup>1</sup>

The Department has been informed by NASA that, as announced May 3, an unarmed plane, a U-2 weather research plane based at Adana, Turkey, piloted by a civilian has been missing since May 1. During the flight of this plane, the pilot reported difficulty with his oxygen equipment. Mr. Khrushchev has announced that a U.S. plane has been shot down over the U.S.S.R. on that date. It may be that this was the missing plane. It is entirely possible that having failure in the oxygen equipment, which could result in the pilot losing consciousness, the plane continued on automatic pilot for a considerable distance and accidentally violated Soviet airspace. The United States is taking this matter up with the Soviet Government, with particular reference to the fate of the pilot.

#### U.S. NOTE OF MAY 6<sup>2</sup>

The Embassy of the United States of America by instruction of its Government has the honor to state the following:

The United States Government has noted the statement of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, N. S. Khrushchev, in his speech before the Supreme Soviet on May 5 that a foreign air-

craft crossed the border of the Soviet Union on May 1 and that on orders of the Soviet Government, this aircraft was shot down. In this same statement it was said that investigation showed that it was a United States plane.

As already announced on May 3, a United States National Aeronautical Space Agency unarmed weather research plane based at Adana, Turkey, and piloted by a civilian American has been missing since May 1. The name of the American civilian pilot is Francis Gary Powers, born on August 17, 1929, at Jenkins, Kentucky.

In the light of the above the United States Government requests the Soviet Government to provide it with full facts of the Soviet investigation of this incident and to inform it of the fate of the pilot.

#### DEPARTMENT STATEMENT, MAY 7<sup>3</sup>

The Department has received the text of Mr. Khrushchev's further remarks about the unarmed plane which is reported to have been shot down in the Soviet Union. As previously announced, it was known that a U-2 plane was missing. As a result of the inquiry ordered by the President it has been established that insofar as the authorities in Washington are concerned there was no authorization for any such flight as described by Mr. Khrushchev.

Nevertheless it appears that in endeavoring to obtain information now concealed behind the Iron Curtain a flight over Soviet territory was probably undertaken by an unarmed civilian U-2 plane.

It is certainly no secret that, given the state of the world today, intelligence collection activities are practiced by all countries, and postwar history certainly reveals that the Soviet Union has not been lagging behind in this field.

The necessity for such activities as measures for legitimate national defense is enhanced by the excessive secrecy practiced by the Soviet Union in contrast to the free world.

One of the things creating tension in the world today is apprehension over surprise attack with weapons of mass destruction.

To reduce mutual suspicion and to give a measure of protection against surprise attack the

<sup>1</sup> Read to news correspondents on May 5 by Lincoln White, Director of the Office of News.

<sup>2</sup> Delivered by the American Embassy at Moscow to the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs on May 6 (press release 249).

<sup>3</sup> Read to news correspondents on May 7 by Mr. White.

United States in 1955 offered its open-skies proposal—a proposal which was rejected out of hand by the Soviet Union. It is in relation to the danger of surprise attack that planes of the type of unarmed civilian U-2 aircraft have made flights along the frontiers of the free world for the past 4 years.

## Research Program To Detect, Identify Underground Nuclear Tests Expanded

White House press release dated May 7

The President on May 7 announced approval of a major expansion of the present research and development directed toward an improved capability to detect and identify underground nuclear explosions. The present U.S. program has evolved from the recommendations set forth by the Panel on Seismic Improvement (Berkner panel).<sup>1</sup> For fiscal year 1960 it has been funded for approximately \$10 million. During fiscal year 1961 it is anticipated that the funds required will be about \$66 million for all aspects of the seismic research and development program.

Known as Project Vela, the program calls for increased basic research in seismology; procurement of instruments for a worldwide seismic research program; development of improved seismic instruments; construction and operation of prototype seismic detection stations; and an experimental program of underground detonations encompassing both high explosive and, where necessary, nuclear explosions. The planned program provides for investigation of all aspects of improvement that are considered to be feasible.

Such nuclear explosions as are essential to a full understanding of both the capabilities of the presently proposed detection system and the potential for improvements in this system would be carried out under fully contained conditions and would

<sup>1</sup>For a summary of the conclusions reported by the panel on Mar. 16, 1959, see BULLETIN of July 6, 1959, p. 16.

produce no radioactive fallout. In order to develop sufficient reliable data from the program, it is anticipated that it will be necessary to conduct a series of explosions of various sizes in differing types of geological formations.

Recently the Soviet negotiators at Geneva concurred with the proposal that underground nuclear explosions should be conducted to improve the capability of the proposed control network to detect and identify underground explosions.

They have also indicated a willingness to discuss research and development in the seismic detection area with the United States and the United Kingdom. Agreement has been reached to convene a group of U.S.S.R., U.K., and U.S. scientists in Geneva on May 11 to exchange information on the seismic research activities of the three nations as a basis for future determination of the areas in which coordinated or joint research would be most fruitful.

Government agencies including the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Interior, as well as universities and private organizations, will participate in carrying out the United States program of research and development related to the detection and identification of nuclear detonations.

## Documents on Disarmament Talks Made Available for Reference

Press release 233 dated May 2

The Department of State on May 2 made available for reference the verbatims of the Conference of the Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee for the period from March 15 to 31, 1960. The release was made pursuant to an agreement reached last month by the 10 negotiating parties that verbatims of the conference sessions will be released on a monthly basis 1 month after the sessions take place. Release of verbatims of subsequent sessions will follow this procedure.

## Disarmament: The Problem and the Prospects

by Francis O. Wilcox

*Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs*<sup>1</sup>

I warmly welcome the opportunity to meet with members of the American Society of International Law, whose signal contributions to scholarship and whose continuing influence on international affairs are recognized throughout the world.

It is a special challenge to address this distinguished group. That is so primarily because your interest and qualifications cover a very wide spectrum, ranging from particular questions of international law and practice to fundamental issues of international peace and order. And it is a high tribute to this organization that this is indeed the case.

Tonight I would like to speak to you about one of these fundamental questions, perhaps the most vital and the most critical of world problems. I refer to the problem of disarmament.

### The Urgent Need for Disarmament

The infinitely destructive capabilities of modern warfare have given new focus and urgency to disarmament efforts. I fear that we now take for granted "kilotons" and "megatons" as measures of destructive power. These words, describing nuclear and thermonuclear explosive power in terms of its equivalent in thousands or millions of tons of TNT, have become commonplace. Their impact on the human mind has accordingly tended to diminish. Yet the fact remains that a single plane today can deliver more destructive power than *all* of the planes in *all* of the air forces delivered during the Second World War.

Let us clearly note, moreover, that nuclear weapons technology and capacity may not remain

the exclusive province of those who now possess them. Others can no doubt develop this capability. We thus face clear prospects of the proliferation of nuclear weapons among the states of the world, with all that this would portend in added hazard to international peace.

I do not need to emphasize here other aspects of the problem of peace and security: the rapid development of missiles, the entry of manmade objects—and soon man himself—into outer space, the advances in chemical and biological methods of warfare. Nor do I need to address myself to the tremendous economic burden of armaments in the world.

Yesterday [April 27] in his press conference, President Eisenhower said that he could "see no reason why the sums which now are going into these sterile, negative mechanisms that we call war munitions shouldn't go into something positive." In this connection it is significant that the amount of money spent for national defense in this world in 1 year would pay for all the activities and programs of the United Nations for the next 500 years. For the totality of this problem is such that the search for disarmament has become a prime imperative of our times.

But we must not be maneuvered into disarmament at any price. The disarmament arrangements we see—and must find—are those that through mutual application and safeguarded implementation will enhance our security and not leave us and our free-world associates open and vulnerable to aggressive action.

Tomorrow, in Geneva, the 10-nation disarmament group, which is the focal point of present disarmament efforts, will recess for 6 weeks until after the meeting at the summit.

<sup>1</sup> Address made before the American Society of International Law at Washington, D.C., on Apr. 28 (press release 226).

There are some who have criticized us for agreeing to a disarmament forum based on equal representation with the Communist bloc. However, the reasons for this are clear and, I think, substantial.

The withdrawal of the Soviet Union from the U.N. Disarmament Subcommittee in 1957 left us without an agreed forum for disarmament negotiations. We believed that no avenue should be left unexplored which might offer prospects for progress on this crucial problem. We were convinced that, although detailed disarmament negotiations would take place for the time being outside the U.N. by the establishment of the Committee of Ten,<sup>2</sup> this would not diminish the United Nations' responsibility for general disarmament. As a matter of fact, if agreement can be achieved among the Ten in Geneva, it will contribute substantially to a fuller realization of the purposes and principles of the charter.

This view was reflected by the General Assembly in a resolution unanimously adopted at its past session.<sup>3</sup> The resolution expressed the hope that measures leading toward the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control would be worked out in detail and agreed upon in the shortest possible time.

#### **U.S. Objectives at Geneva**

We approach the disarmament problem with two basic aims:

First, to try urgently to create a more stable military environment in order to curtail the risk of war.

Second, to reduce national armed forces and armaments and to strengthen international peace-keeping machinery to the point where aggression will be deterred by international rather than national force.

To accomplish the first objective, we believe it is necessary to undertake measures to guard against surprise attack, to halt future nuclear weapons production, to reduce existing nuclear weapons stockpiles, to bring about balanced reductions in conventional arms and armed forces, and to initiate measures to assure the peaceful use of outer space.

<sup>2</sup> For background, see BULLETIN of Sept. 28, 1959, p. 438.

<sup>3</sup> For a statement by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and text of the resolution, see *ibid.*, Nov. 23, 1959, p. 765.

But we would not be satisfied to stop with these achievements. We want to move on toward the elimination of weapons of mass destruction and toward the reduction of national armed forces and armaments to levels required only for internal security purposes and to carry out obligations under the United Nations Charter. At the same time we want to foster universally accepted rules of law, backed by a world court and an international armed force, which would prevent any nation from launching an aggression.

This, in brief, sets the scene for the first round of negotiations which have taken place over the past weeks in Geneva. The Soviets thus far have not been willing to discuss the obvious and specific initial measures I have outlined. Without burdening you with the details, I should like to outline some of the basic differences in approach to the problem of disarmament taken by the Communist bloc and ourselves.

#### **The Mirage of Agreement in Principle**

So far the Communist representatives at Geneva have refused to consider any proposals which do not endorse in principle the Soviet version of general and complete disarmament. This Soviet tactic in negotiation is all too familiar. All too often the Communists seem more interested in slogans than in serious negotiations.

We have been exposed before to these tactics. "Ban the bomb," "Stop all nuclear testing"—these are familiar slogans which have a certain superficial appeal.

This time the Communists talk about "general and complete disarmament" as if this were a trademark which they had registered and as if its acceptance constituted the only way to make progress in disarmament. During the first 3 days of negotiations at Geneva, the Communist delegates used the phrase "general and complete disarmament" 135 times. They dodge the question of effective international controls, and thus the slogan is just as misleading and just as superficial as the earlier mirages.

Even the General Assembly resolution, which was cosponsored by all of the members of the United Nations and which expressed the hope for "general and complete disarmament under effective international control" becomes in Mr. Zorin's

<sup>4</sup> V. A. Zorin, chairman of Soviet delegation to the Ten-Nation Disarmament Conference.



speeches, and in his satellites' echoes, United Nations endorsement of the Soviet plan. But when this resolution is cited by the Communists, it is usually rewritten, and the vital provision "under effective international control" conveniently disappears. Even when the Soviets do make reference to controls, they tend to give only lip service to a concept and do not make a serious effort to develop an effective system of verification.

The Soviets seem interested only in what label is put on the disarmament package. In the light of our previous experience with them in the use of slogans, we are interested primarily in the contents. Until agreement is reached on the contents, how can the label mean anything?

What we seek is a secure, free, and peaceful world in which there would be general disarmament under effective international safeguards and agreed procedures for the settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

To this end we have submitted concrete proposals<sup>5</sup> on the basis of which the 10-nation group could begin immediately to hammer out specific measures of real disarmament. The Communist side has not been willing to negotiate on specific disarmament measures but has contented itself with urging agreement in principle on abolition of all armies, armaments, and war ministries within 4 years.

#### **The Need for Verification**

At Geneva the Soviets have thus far sought to avoid any serious negotiation about the question of control and inspection, although they acknowledge that this is an essential element in any general disarmament agreement. In this approach they are reflecting the historic reluctance of Communist disarmament negotiators to talk about, much less to agree upon, concrete arrangements to assure that disarmament measures are actually observed.

I find it wholly understandable that the Soviet Union, with its phobia for secrecy and with its broad access to information about developments in the free world, should find disarmament control arrangements highly undesirable on the one hand and perhaps even unnecessary on the other. Yet precisely these same factors make it impera-

tive for the free world to insist upon an adequate system of inspection for verifying compliance with disarmament agreements. In this area, which is clearly vital to our own security, we cannot rely on promises alone. Control and inspection procedures must be part and parcel of any agreed disarmament measures.

The Communist group frequently alleges that proposals for a verification system are designed for purposes of espionage. They characterize these proposals as a wish on our part to look into everybody's bedroom and into everybody's garden. Now obviously effective international control machinery will certainly result in the gathering and exchange of information. But this should not go beyond what is necessary to establish and sustain confidence. Equal assurance to both sides that commitments under a disarmament agreement are being carried out is essential. This is the essence of international control.

In my dictionary, "espionage" is defined as the practice of spying on others or the employment of spies and the systematic secret observation of the words and conduct of others. This is by no means the definition of the operations of an internationally agreed organization whose task is to gather and receive information which will assure both sides that the disarmament agreement is being carried out.

In spite of this essentially negative and grudging approach to the central problem of control and inspection, the Soviets must come to realize that we will insist upon adequate control arrangements in any disarmament agreement.

I would like to be quite clear on one point. In this imperfect world we do not expect to see a 100 percent perfect system of controls. Nor are we seeking controls for the sake of controls. Our prime purpose has been, and remains, to work out disarmament agreements that will reduce the prospects of war and the burden of armaments. We attach the utmost importance to our efforts to achieve this goal. As a part of such arrangements, we seek only that degree of control and verification which will permit the world to know that the agreements are being kept by all parties. We ask the Soviets to accept nothing that we will not ourselves accept. If the Soviet Union will approach this question in the same reasonable way, I am confident that significant progress can be made.

<sup>5</sup>For text, see BULLETIN of Apr. 4, 1960, p. 511.



## Measures of Nuclear Disarmament

I now turn to the question of our respective approaches to the problem of nuclear armaments. It is clear that the Soviet attitude on this matter is motivated by both political and strategic considerations. The Soviet Union has attempted to create pressures throughout the world which would inhibit free-world use of nuclear weapons in defense against aggression. In strategic terms, there can be little doubt that the Soviets have regarded nuclear weapons as an important element in Western strength. They have undoubtedly reasoned that, if we could be effectively precluded from the possibility of using nuclear weapons in our own defense, while Soviet strength in conventional armaments was retained, our strategic position would be impaired.

Thus over a period of years the Soviet purpose has been to "ban the bomb." In the present negotiations at Geneva this theme is once again being played. The Soviets have again proposed that each nuclear power should agree not to use nuclear weapons first. They also propose the complete elimination of nuclear weapons but have admitted that this could not be verified by existing techniques.

How does the United States look at this problem?

We have recognized, and continue to recognize, the need to deal effectively with nuclear weapons in any comprehensive disarmament arrangement. We believe, however, that nuclear and conventional disarmament measures must be balanced so that no country or group of countries will obtain, at any stage, a significant military advantage. We proposed that early steps be taken to limit the continuing buildup in nuclear weapons. As an initial step we seek an agreed cutoff, under proper safeguards, in the future production of nuclear materials for weapons purposes. We also propose to begin reduction of existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons materials by siphoning off agreed quantities for peaceful uses.

One of our ultimate goals in a disarmament agreement is the final elimination of nuclear weapons as may be feasible in the light of technical and scientific knowledge. Let me note this important point: At the present time it would not be scientifically possible to establish means of verification to confirm whether nuclear stockpiles had in fact been eliminated. Today a would-be aggres-

sor could conceal nuclear weapons without any fear of detection.

But, as I have noted, there are important steps that can be taken now. We hope that the Soviets will agree to the specific measures in this area which I have already outlined.

## Outer Space

Recognizing that the world stands on the threshold of the space age, the United States has again proposed at Geneva, as it has in the United Nations for the past 3 years, that steps be taken toward insuring the use of outer space for peaceful purposes only. We have specifically proposed that there should be a prohibition, with appropriate controls, against placing into orbit or stationing in outer space vehicles carrying weapons of mass destruction. Technological advances in this field have been astounding. Satellites are being sent aloft with increasing frequency. Scientists will no doubt soon discover ways to bring orbiting bodies back to a predetermined point on earth. The military implications of this are profoundly evident.

It is for these reasons that Soviet failure to deal concretely with the problems of preventing weapons of mass destruction from being introduced into outer space is so disquieting. There may be real danger that we will soon reach the point of no return so far as control of vehicles in outer space is concerned.

One could draw an unhappy parallel with the Soviet rejection in 1947 of the United States proposal to forgo the American monopoly of atomic weapons and establish full international control of atomic energy. We know now that the Soviet out-of-hand refusal to consider this extraordinary proposal was a tragic turning point in history.

We hope the present attitude of the Soviet Union with respect to outer space does not portend the same kind of fateful choice. It would be tragic indeed if the nations of the world were to extend to the vast reaches of outer space the military rivalries which plague man here on earth.

## Maintaining Peace in a Disarmed World

Another basic difference between the Western and the Communist approach to disarmament is highlighted by our proposal that, as disarmament is achieved, steps must be taken to strengthen and

build up the machinery to maintain peace. The Soviet Union seems to maintain that existing arrangements are adequate and vigorously opposes the concept of an international force.

Fortunately we already have a strong foundation on which to build such peacekeeping machinery. The United Nations was established for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Our aim, accordingly, is a stronger United Nations. Perhaps the time is approaching when new efforts should be made toward making this Organization a more effective instrument for peace. Let me repeat—we have in the United Nations the structure on which to build. There is nothing wrong with the charter that good will could not cure.

We must also seek to accelerate the development of international law, looking toward the rule of law in the world. Certainly it would make a tremendous difference if states showed a fair-minded and careful regard for generally recognized legal rules. Far more use should be made of the International Court of Justice. Greater use should be made of advisory opinions. And further steps should be taken to extend the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

In this connection may I say that I regret very much that it has not yet been possible to take the steps necessary to permit this Government to embrace with complete fidelity the principle of compulsory jurisdiction.

It would be a mistake to assume that, if the point is reached where national armed forces have been reduced by mutual agreement to the militia level, the danger of aggression will have been automatically eliminated. There have been many cases in the past few years when frontiers were crossed and distinctly military actions were carried out by lightly armed forces. We are all too familiar with the pattern of indirect aggression and know that men armed with only light weapons—rifles, submachine guns, pistols, and hand grenades—can promote civil disorder and contribute to the overthrow of the government of a neighboring state.

In the light of these present-day experiences it is clear that there would be need for an effective international force to help keep the peace and repel aggression in a world where national armaments have been substantially reduced. As we

have proposed in Geneva, such a force should operate within the framework of the United Nations. Without such a force a world fully disarmed except for rifles, or, for that matter, sticks and stones, would still not adequately guarantee peace and security.

The Soviets do not accept this concept. In an article published last fall—incidentally at about the same time the Soviet Union was putting forth its slogan of “general and complete” disarmament—*Pravda* warned against the creation of an international police force “armed to the teeth” which would be used for “suppressing peoples determined to change the social system in their countries.”

We must consider seriously, even if the Communists choose not to, the anarchy and risks of aggression to which a disarmed world would be exposed if there were not at the same time recognized rules of law enforced by strong United Nations peacekeeping machinery.

#### Nuclear Test Talks

The differences in approach which I have briefly described on certain fundamental areas of the disarmament problem suggest to you, I am sure, why our negotiators at Geneva fully realize that they have a long and difficult road ahead. Thus far, perhaps not unexpectedly, they have little reason to be encouraged by the Soviet attitude.

But our efforts in the disarmament field cover a broad front. And we do find some reason for encouragement. The atmosphere in an adjoining conference room at Geneva is cautiously optimistic. I refer to the talks where American, British, and Soviet delegations have been working for the past 18 months on an agreement looking toward a controlled ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

Here we have proposed that a treaty be concluded which would end all nuclear weapons tests where adequate controls can be agreed. This would exempt small underground explosions. However, we recently stated a willingness to agree to a temporary, voluntary moratorium on these small underground explosions where adequate control is not now possible.<sup>6</sup> Such a moratorium,

<sup>6</sup> For text of a joint declaration by President Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Macmillan, see *ibid.*, Apr. 18, 1960, p. 587.

however, is conditioned on progress being made in the negotiations on various important issues that now separate the two sides and on arrangements being made for a coordinated research program aimed at finding more reliable means of identifying small underground disturbances.

However, there are still important political and technical issues to work out. Agreement must still be reached on such critical matters as the basis and frequency of on-site inspections of areas where unidentified seismic events have occurred within the territories of the parties. This is a major obstacle. The Soviets insist that the number of such inspections should be limited and based on a purely political decision. We believe that this is not a political question but that inspections should be based on detection capabilities and scientific facts.

Still another matter at issue is the composition of the staff manning the control posts which will be established within the three countries and throughout the world. The Soviets wish to have a predominance of host-country nationals in the control posts. We cannot accept this since it would amount to self-inspection. In the light of the need to insure objectivity, we have proposed that the control posts be manned by an international staff made up of one-third host-country nationals, one-third from the other side, and one-third from other countries.

Further issues include voting procedures, where the shadow of the veto is still with us, procedures to govern explosions for peaceful purposes, and the composition of the seven-nation control commission.

However, in the 18 months of painstaking and patient negotiations—a prerequisite for conducting diplomatic talks with the Soviets—we have reached agreement on a preamble and 17 draft articles and an annex of a treaty, as well as certain important technical matters.<sup>7</sup>

The most significant point is that the Soviets have agreed to the establishment of control posts

<sup>7</sup> Copies of the agreed documents (drafts of a preamble and various articles of a treaty on the discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests, together with a draft annex on a preparatory commission) are available upon request from the Office of Public Services, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

in Soviet territory to be manned in part by non-Soviet personnel to verify compliance with the treaty. Thus there is some basis for cautious optimism at that conference, and we can only hope that some of this optimism will pervade the adjoining conference room, where the disarmament negotiators will be meeting when they resume their talks in June.

#### **Do the Soviets Want Disarmament?**

In view of the frustrations we have experienced over many years in trying to negotiate disarmament arrangements with the Soviet Union, people often ask whether the Soviets really want disarmament. I do not pretend to know the answer, but I would suggest that there may be several reasons why the Soviet Union should be genuinely interested in agreement on disarmament. First of these is the very human fear of the devastation that would be visited on all peoples alike by a total nuclear war. The ravages of World War II in destruction of their manpower and capital plant and equipment must have left a profound impression on the Communist leaders. They are intelligent men, and they must be able to visualize the incomparably greater ravages which a nuclear war would bring.

In the second place, the burden of supporting military establishments in the nuclear age is extremely costly both in men and materials. The losses of World War II also resulted in a deficiency in Soviet manpower, a particularly critical problem in light of the intensive Soviet campaign to increase industrial output and reclaim lands in Siberia. There are also increasing demands by Soviet citizens for more of the comforts of life. It is difficult to know exactly how much of a role each of these considerations might play in Soviet policy formulation, but there can be no denying the increasing competition for the resources and the productive energies of the state.

There are certainly other considerations as well. These could involve such matters as Soviet assessment of the balance of military advantage in any disarmament agreement, their estimate of the political advantages that might be derived from any such agreement, and their relative view of the prospects for achieving their objectives by either military or nonmilitary means.

I do not propose to attempt to strike a balance of all these factors. And I am sure there are others as well. But there are at least some reasons why the U.S.S.R. could be seriously interested in making progress toward disarmament. We strongly hope this is the case.

Perhaps the most difficult part of the equation is how much they might be willing to pay for disarmament by way of opening up their system to the inspection that would be required. I have already spoken of the difficulties we have experienced over a long period in this regard. But we must not, and will not, give up hope.

### Concluding Comment

What, then, are the prospects for progress in the months ahead?

With the adjournment of the conference in Geneva tomorrow, we turn our eyes to the summit. In just 2 weeks, the Heads of Government of the United States, France, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union will meet in Paris. Disarmament will assuredly be one of the topics of highest priority. It is our fervent hope that the Soviets will join with us in giving the necessary impetus to the disarmament negotiations so that when the 10-nation conference reconvenes in June it can come to grips with the concrete measures which could eventually relieve man of the tremendous burden of armaments and free him from the specter of war.

Until acceptable disarmament arrangements are negotiated, we must continue to look to our own defenses. There is no other way if negotiations are to succeed. There is no other way if world peace is to be maintained. We know that the realization of the ultimate goal of world disarmament which we seek lies in the distant future. But this is no reason for us to be fatalistic and to concede that nuclear catastrophe is inescapable. As Thucydides reminds us, "Fatalism tends to produce what it dreads, for men do not oppose that which they consider inevitable."

I continue to believe that, if mankind is ingenious enough in the scientific field to forge the weapons capable of destroying himself, he has the innate wisdom and capacity in the political field to work out the means of preserving and advancing civilization.

## Crown Prince and Princess of Japan To Visit U.S.

*Statement by President Eisenhower*

White House press release dated May 7

At the time of Prime Minister Kishi's visit last January,<sup>1</sup> I expressed the hope that the Crown Prince [Akihito] and Princess [Michiko] would be able to visit the United States during the centennial year of Japanese-American relations. I am now happy to announce that Their Imperial Highnesses have accepted my invitation and will be in Washington from September 27 to September 29.

They will be welcomed in the spirit of cordial friendship and mutual respect which characterizes relations between our two great nations.

## Messages by President and Secretary on Japanese Centennial

**President Eisenhower**

White House press release dated May 3

One hundred years ago Japan sent its first embassy to Washington to exchange ratifications of the Treaty of Amity and Commerce between Japan and the United States.<sup>2</sup> In extending a warm welcome to this embassy, the President expressed, on behalf of the American people, his deep gratification at this beginning of closer relations with Japan.

This historic occasion laid the foundation for our friendship, and a remarkable cultural, economic, and political interchange between our two countries. I am happy to say that the bonds of friendship between our two peoples are stronger today than ever before.

Japan and the United States are joined in a partnership based on mutual trust, mutual respect, and full cooperation. We are both dedicated to the task of helping build a better world, where there will be peace and justice for all.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Feb. 8, 1960, p. 179.

<sup>2</sup> For an article by E. Taylor Parks on "The First Japanese Diplomatic Mission to the United States—1860," see BULLETIN of May 9, 1960, p. 744.



## Secretary Herter

Press release 238 dated May 3

I am happy to join with all Japanese and Americans who this year are celebrating the hundredth anniversary of the Treaty of Amity and Commerce between Japan and the United States. This is a fitting time to review the many ways in which our two countries have profited during their long relationship.

In the early stages of the Meiji era, when Japan opened its doors to the West, we established firm economic and cultural ties. In recent years

these ties have been greatly strengthened, and today Japan and the United States are working together in a close partnership that serves not only the enlightened self-interest of both countries but also the cause of peace, justice, and progress.

In this centennial year we recall the many valuable contributions each country has made to the other. And we look forward to an even warmer friendship and closer relations as we enter the second century of our relations.

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER

## United States and Nepal Affirm Mutual Desire To Work for World Order Based on International Justice

*His Majesty Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah Deva, King of Nepal, and Her Majesty Ratna Rajya Lakshmi Shah, Queen of Nepal, made an official visit to the United States from April 25 to May 12 at the invitation of President Eisenhower.<sup>1</sup> Following are the texts of a joint communique released at Washington April 28 and King Mahendra's address before a joint session of Congress on that same day, together with an exchange of greetings between President Eisenhower and the King at Washington National Airport on April 27, an exchange of toasts at a state dinner at the White House that evening, and a list of the members of the official party.*

### JOINT COMMUNIQUE, APRIL 28

White House press release dated April 28

The President of the United States and His Majesty Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah Deva, King of Nepal, today held a friendly and fruitful discussion on various matters of mutual interest.

King Mahendra, who is visiting the United

States upon the invitation of the President, has also addressed a joint session of the United States Congress. At the conclusion of his Washington stay on April 30, King Mahendra will begin a twelve-day coast-to-coast tour of the United States, during which he will meet with various civic, cultural, and business leaders.

The President expressed great admiration for the steps which have been taken under the leadership of King Mahendra to foster the growth of democracy in Nepal, as exemplified by the promulgation of a constitution by the King and by the holding of general elections in 1959 under the provisions of that constitution.

In their review of the world situation, the President and King Mahendra expressed their mutual concern with the vital problem of achieving lasting peace and establishing a world order based on international justice. They reaffirmed their determination to work toward those goals, the achievement of which will contribute immensely to the general progress, prosperity, and welfare of mankind.

The President and King Mahendra agreed that the American people and the Nepalese people have in common the virtues of tolerance, charity, and benevolence, which virtues should serve as the basis of relations between all nations. The

<sup>1</sup> Their Majesties were in Washington, D.C., April 27-30. Upon completion of the official portion of the visit, they continued their tour of the United States informally until their departure from New York City on June 1.



President and King Mahendra agreed further that Nepal and the United States share a profound belief in the sovereignty and independence of nations and in genuine noninterference in the affairs of others. The President and King Mahendra agreed that any attempt by any nation to impose its own economic system or political beliefs on any other country should be condemned.

The President and King Mahendra expressed a common belief that social and economic progress should be achieved by all peoples in the manner of their own choosing and in government based on consent of the governed and the dignity of the human individual. In this spirit, the President assured King Mahendra of the continuing readiness of the United States to be of assistance to the Government of Nepal in its high objective of developing the resources of the country for the welfare of its people.

The President and King Mahendra expressed their mutual desire to maintain and further strengthen the cordiality and genuine friendship which has always characterized Nepalese-American relations and which has been so evident during the King's visit.

#### **ADDRESS BEFORE THE CONGRESS, APRIL 28**

Unofficial translation

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Congress: We are very much touched by the warmth and spontaneity of emotions and feeling with which we have been received here. With a deep sense of honor and privilege we avail ourselves of the opportunity to address this august assembly. We regard this invitation to us as a token of your friendship and good will toward the people of Nepal, who in their turn have nothing but the greatest respect and admiration for the great people and the leaders of the United States of America. It is my pleasant duty to convey to you and through you to all the citizens of this great Republic the sincere greetings and salutations of the Government and the people of Nepal.

Different nations have acquired influence and leadership in the world in different periods of history. But no other nation at its height of power and prosperity, glory and greatness, had in the past thought in the same benevolent terms about the poverty and hardships of the less for-

tunate people in other countries of the world as you have been doing in your own time. Your pioneering spirit in this field and dedication to the great and noble task of helping to alleviate the conditions of poverty and suffering wherever they may exist have served to focus universal attention on this question of serving humanity as a matter of international responsibility.

We had till 12 years ago very little to do with each other, even in the way of trade and diplomatic relations. Till then few Americans had visited Nepal and the Nepalese who had visited America could actually be counted on the fingertips. With the advent of democracy in Nepal things began to change, and since the opening of the U.S. Operations Mission our contacts have increased rapidly and hundreds of Nepalese have come to this country for training and studies in various fields. Quite a few American technicians and experts have been to Nepal to help the Nepalese people out on their problems of transport, economy, and agriculture, on those of health and education. We are glad to be able to tell you that the Nepalese have found the American experts friendly and helpful and always willing and eager to help the Nepalese out on their various problems. In recent years an increasingly large number of American tourists have been visiting Nepal, and they are always among the most welcomed visitors.

#### **Common Faith in Democratic Ideals**

Apart from the recent contacts we have referred to above, our common faith in democratic ideals and procedures provides, in our opinion, the lasting basis for greater understanding and co-operation between our two peoples and countries. You are all familiar with the strains and difficulties under which all newly established democracies have to work. The concurrent resolution passed by the U.S. Congress last year on the successful holding of the first-ever elections in Nepal has served as a source of great inspiration and encouragement to the newly elected members of our Parliament in carrying out their duties and responsibilities. Provision for fully representative institutions of government and legislature, respect for fundamental rights and due process of law, respect for freedom and dignity of the individual, are some of the basic principles that underlie the Constitution of Nepal. As is apparent to you, the

Constitution of Nepal is based on the concepts of law, liberty, and rights prevalent for a long time in your own country. Though we are separated from each other by vast expanses of land and water, though our diplomatic relations even do not date far back, there exists between us a lasting moral and spiritual bond that transcends all these material and mundane considerations—a real identity of outlook and views on vital problems of man and society that is derived from common faith in common political principles, ideals, and beliefs.

As a nation we have always prized freedom more than anything else in our history. We believe in an independent foreign policy of judging every international issue on its merits without consideration of anybody's fear or favor and in a policy of nonalignment and nonentanglement. Our record in the United Nations will bear testimony to the above fact. This may sound a little idealistic and a little too impractical, but as a small nation we feel that this is the only way in which we can best contribute to the discussions and deliberations in the United Nations and to the interests of world peace and friendly relations among nations.

Our policy of nonalignment does not arise from our desire to sit on the fence or to evade responsibility in any way. It is merely a manifestation of our reluctance and unwillingness to compromise our freedom of judgment and action beforehand by committing ourselves to support one side or the other even before the emergence of such an eventuality. We believe in retaining as long as possible our freedom of judgment for determining the right course of action in any situation. We do not see anything immoral, or selfish, or passive about it. We do not believe in shirking action, once we feel satisfied and convinced about the right course. We shall certainly not be neutral when we are confronted with the choice between good and evil, or right and wrong.

#### **Ending Tensions Between Nations**

Unfortunately the world we live in is passing through a state of uneasy peace and tension between nations. The sooner this state of fear and uncertainty is ended, the better prospects will emerge for mankind as a whole. This is something which is realized by all, but still it appears as though it will be some time before this realization can be translated into practice to the actual benefit of all concerned. However, men of peace

and good will in every country must work and work ceaselessly and untiringly for peace and for the removal of the threat of war, because war under the present circumstances will mean nothing short of total destruction of human life and civilization.

Rightly have the great leaders of the world described disarmament—both conventional and nuclear—as the greatest and most pressing problem of our time. All the peoples of the world are eagerly awaiting the successful outcome of the Geneva negotiations on disarmament and nuclear tests ban. Will it be too much to hope that the negotiations in Geneva will result at least in some limited agreement in this field which could be formally registered at the impending summit meeting and announced to trembling humanity as a prelude to better times and broader agreements among nations in the near future? We hope and believe that the impending summit conference and the ones that are proposed thereafter will have the effect of easing tension in the world and registering real progress toward peace, disarmament, and settlement of the outstanding political disputes between nations.

We have not the slightest doubt about the peaceful intentions of the American people. Now it is for her to prove her initiative and skill in convincing other great and small countries about the need for the gradual evolution of a new international order based on freedom, justice, and peace for all and fully responsive to the needs and challenge of the time. The way in which the great powers can meet the greatest challenge of our time and perhaps of history is by turning the present-day situation, fraught with the risks of nuclear war, into the pooling of the resources of the nations of the world for the eradication of poverty and needs from everywhere. We cannot help feeling that, if even a small fraction of one hundred billion dollars that is being presently spent on defense and war expenditure in the world is devoted to the development of the underdeveloped countries, the world would for everybody be an infinitely better and happier place to live in.

We all know that in the history of mankind war has caused serious setbacks to progress and civilization and has always taken a heavy toll of human life. We have faced the devastating effects and grim consequences of the two world wars which took place during the lifetime of many in

our own generation. The finest flower of youth and manhood in every country were decimated in the two world wars, and we can very well imagine the sense of horror haunting the minds of the people heavily loaded with the very bitter memory of the loss of their sons, brothers, and husbands. We hardly need emphasize that no nation in the world, big or small, will remain unaffected in the event of another global war. It is the sincere desire for peace and freedom in the hearts of the 9 million of our countrymen that has prompted us to conclude this address with the following exhortation in the immortal words of your great leader and a great son of America, Abraham Lincoln, which to our mind literally applies to the present-day global context as well if we only replace the word "nation" by "international community":

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this nation . . . shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Thank you once again for giving us a patient hearing.

#### **EXCHANGE OF GREETINGS, APRIL 27**

White House press release dated April 27

##### **The President**

Your Majesties, it is indeed a great honor to welcome you here to the United States. The American people are delighted that you have found it possible to lay down your own responsibilities long enough to come and make this visit to our country.

It is truly an historic occasion. This is the first time that a reigning monarch of Nepal has set foot on this continent, and we are indeed proud that you have found it possible to do so.

The friendly relations between your country and ours are a matter of common knowledge. They have long existed. They have been strong and cordial, and we are confident that your visit here will do much to strengthen them and sustain them.

So, sir, and to you, Your Majesty, we—the people, the Government, and I—join in saying wel-

come, and we hope that you find our country interesting and that every minute of your stay here will be enjoyable.

#### **His Majesty King Mahendra**

Unofficial translation

Your Excellency, and ladies and gentlemen: We are all very happy to be here on your very kind invitation. We heartily welcome this opportunity for the exchange of views with such a great leader as you, who have distinguished yourself in the service of your nation in both war and peace and have always stood for the cause of peace and freedom in the world.

We hope and trust that our visit will further strengthen the existing bonds of friendship and cordiality between our two countries.

We bring to you, Mr. President, the greetings and salutations of the people of Nepal and also through you, sir, convey their best wishes to the people of the United States.

During our visit in the United States in the next few days we will be looking forward to meeting the people in the different parts of the country and acquiring a firsthand knowledge of the great achievements the American people have made in different spheres of national endeavor.

Your Excellency, we thank you from the bottom of our hearts for the kind and generous words of welcome you have just addressed to us and take this opportunity to express our good wishes for the happiness and prosperity of this great land.

Thank you, Mr. President.

#### **EXCHANGE OF TOASTS, APRIL 27**

White House press release dated April 27

##### **The President**

Your Majesties and my friends: It is indeed an honor for us to gather this evening to welcome to this Capital and to this house the King and Queen of Nepal. We are especially honored because it is the first time that a ruling monarch of Nepal has set foot on this land.

The times are gone when we feel that geography means much to the relations between countries. We have become neighbors through the miracle of modern inventions, communications, and transportation, and we have come to know more of each other. Up until now we have known about such

countries as Nepal only by reports from a few adventurous travelers—a few of whom, Your Majesty, are here present this evening—but they have told us about a people that is sturdy, proud of its independence and its liberty, and determined to sustain it. Those are the qualities that Americans admire and respect, and try themselves to show.

It is certain, therefore, that as you go about this country you will be greeted with the utmost friendliness, respect, and admiration, and indeed our great hope of knowing—through the members of your party and yourself and your gracious Queen—your people. I think that your visit here cannot fail to stimulate greater travel between our two peoples. This is all to the good because this means a greater understanding among the peoples, and international understanding is the only foundation upon which true peace can be built.

And so, sir, as you come here as the representative and the ruler of your people, as through you we try to send to them greetings and our best wishes for their success and their continued progress, I know that this company will want to join me in raising our glasses to your health and happiness. Ladies and gentlemen, the King!

#### **His Majesty King Mahendra**

Unofficial translation

Your Excellency, ladies and gentlemen: With your permission I would like to offer on behalf of the Queen, ourselves, and all those who have accompanied us, heartfelt thanks to the President for his most generous expression of good will to us and our people.

During this brief period of history of diplomatic and friendly association between our two countries, it is for the first time that a personal meeting between the two heads of state has taken place. In the long history of our nation it is also the first time that an occupant of the throne of Nepal has set foot on American soil. We welcome this opportunity of having a free and frank exchange of views on subjects of mutual interest, and especially on the means and possibility of further strengthening the friendly relations between our two countries, both of which share a common belief in the democratic way of life.

Mr. President, my Government and people have always welcomed and appreciated the initiative and efforts on your part for the furtherance of the cause of peace in the world. We would like

to take this opportunity to offer our best wishes for the success of the summit conference due to be held next month and venture to express the hope that the whole world will benefit by its outcome.

We are happy to receive this opportunity to meet the American people and their leaders in various spheres of their national life and activity.

Ladies and gentlemen, may we now request you all to join us in toasting the health and happiness of the President and Mrs. Eisenhower.

#### **MEMBERS OF OFFICIAL PARTY**

The Department of State announced on April 22 (press release 207) that the following persons would accompany King Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah Deva and Queen Ratna Rajya Lakshmi Shah during the official portion of Their Majesties' visit:

Subarna S. J. B. Rana, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance, Planning, and Development

Mrs. Subarna S. J. B. Rana

Rishikesh Shaha, Ambassador of Nepal

Mrs. Shaha<sup>a</sup>

Brig. Gen. Sher Bahadur Malla, Military Secretary to the King

Kaji Pushpa Raj, Principal Personal Secretary to the King

Mir Subba Iswari Man, Secretary to the King

Maj. Gen. Sovag Jung Thapa, Cabinet and Defense Secretary

Sushil Chandra Haldar, Personal Physician

Jagdish S. Rana, Second Secretary, Embassy of Nepal

#### **U.S. Helps Afghan Airline Acquire Plane for Fleet**

Press release 234 dated May 2

A DC-6B passenger plane, which Afghanistan's airline—Ariana—is acquiring with financial assistance from the U.S. International Cooperation Administration, was dedicated on May 2 at Washington National Airport by Abdul Karim Hakimi, president of the Afghan Air Authority.

The plane, which will be the largest ever to be placed in service by Ariana, will be flown May 3 from Newark Airport to Afghanistan, where it will be immediately placed in operation trans-

<sup>a</sup> Mrs. Shaha accompanied Their Majesties in Washington and New York and on the unofficial portion of the visit.



porting Afghan Muslims on the annual pilgrimage—*Hadj*—to Mecca.

Attending the dedication at which Mr. Hakimi cut the ribbon were Mohammed Hashim Maiwandwal, Afghan Ambassador to the United States; Stellan Wollmar, Director of the ICA Mission in Afghanistan, who is now on consultation in this country; and representatives of Pan American World Airways, which is assisting Afghanistan in civil aviation development under an ICA contract.

The plane is the fifth to be acquired by Ariana with the assistance of a \$5 million loan from ICA to the Government of Afghanistan to help Ariana obtain equipment. The other planes were three DC-3's and a DC-4.

The loan was part of a \$14,560,000 U.S. program of development assistance begun in 1956 to help landlocked Afghanistan to develop civil aviation. In addition to assisting Ariana to acquire equipment, the program has aided Afghanistan in constructing an international airport at Kandahar and three local airports in other parts of Afghanistan, and in establishing air routes.

## Views on Freedom-of-Navigation Amendment to Mutual Security Act

*Following the adoption by the Senate on April 28 of an amendment to section 2 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended,<sup>1</sup> proposed by Senator Paul Douglas and 17 other Senators, Acting Secretary Dillon sent the following letter to Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.*

MAY 2, 1960

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request for the views of the Department of State with respect to the implications of the Douglas Amendment to the Mutual Security bill, I take this opportunity to set forth the following pertinent observations.

As we understand the intent of its 18 sponsors, the Douglas Amendment is designed to support efforts toward eliminating trade restrictions in the Middle East, particularly with respect to those practiced against the State of Israel. I am sure you are aware that this purpose is fully consistent with long-standing objectives of the

United States Government. It is our conviction however, that the inclusion of this Amendment in current Mutual Security legislation will in fact be counter-productive and will not achieve its intended purpose. In addition, such inclusion will in our view have harmful repercussions on United States interests in a wide area of the Middle East.

As you know, a resolution similar to the Douglas Amendment was passed in the House of Representatives at an earlier date. Fully sympathetic with the objective intended, the Department made the text available to our Embassies and Consulates in countries which would be affected by the amendment. In a unanimous expression of opinion our field posts from Morocco to Iraq reported that the adoption of an amendment of this type would clearly not be in the interest of the United States, nor for that matter of Israel.

Our posts abroad emphasized their concurrence with the objective sought by this amendment. They also stressed, however, that regardless of the effect which the amendment might have on the actual level of our assistance to the Middle Eastern states, the amendment would be widely interpreted as: a) demonstrating favoritism for the State of Israel—to the extent that it would render more difficult our efforts to bring about a relaxation of tensions between Israel and the Arab states; and b) an attempt to "tie strings" to our economic aid, and, by implication, to threaten the use of aid as an instrument of political

<sup>1</sup> The Douglas amendment, adopted by a vote of 45 to 25, reads as follows:

"(f) It is the sense of the Congress that inasmuch as—

"(1) the United States favors freedom of navigation in international waterways and economic cooperation between nations; and

"(2) the purposes of this Act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered when nations which receive assistance under this Act wage economic warfare against other nations assisted under this Act, including such procedures as boycotts, blockades, and the restriction of the use of international waterways;

assistance under this Act and the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, shall be administered to give effect to these principles, and, in all negotiations between the United States and any foreign state arising as a result of funds appropriated under this Act or arising under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, these principles shall be applied, as the President may determine, and he shall report on measures taken by the administration to insure their application."



coercion. Our posts pointed out, and the Department of State fully concurs, that incorporation of this amendment would without doubt have the effect of making the task of eliminating the Arab boycott of Israel more difficult and would play into the hands of the Soviet bloc which seeks to exacerbate Middle East tensions to further its penetration of the area.

Our Government has repeatedly made clear, publicly and through diplomatic channels, its support for freedom of transit through the Suez Canal, as well as our opposition to the Arab boycott against Israel. These undesirable restrictions, as you are aware, are an outgrowth of the Palestine problem, which continues to cause tensions between Israel and the Arab states and to perpetuate unfortunate circumstances such as those whereby nearly one million Arab refugees are not able to return to their homes. It is our Government's firm conviction that an Arab-Israel settlement will one day come, not by coercion but by a spirit of accommodation on both sides. As progress is made in that direction, such problems as boycotts, restrictions and homeless refugees will disappear.

Incidentally, there appears to be considerable inaccurate information surrounding the Suez Canal transit question. For example, it is said that American ships are being "barred" from the Canal for having called at Israeli ports. As a matter of fact, not a single American ship has thus far been denied passage through the Canal. Out of a total United States maritime fleet of 498, only 23 ships have been placed on the so-called Arab black-list, because of prior calls at Israeli ports. These 23 are denied entry at Arab ports but there has been no instance of denial of their transit of the Canal.

In this connection you may have read in the press that American labor unions in New York have set up picketing against the United Arab Republic ship *Cleopatra*. The purpose of the picketing is to impel the United Arab Republic to abandon its restrictions against Israel shipping. Unfortunately, this objective is not being served. Asserting their determination to resist such pressures, the Arab countries are establishing counter-picketing against American shipping. This reaction against coercion, which is not unnatural in young emerging states, means in effect that at least 20 American ships with 1,000 seamen aboard

will be affected within the next month. It also means that for every Arab ship Americans may boycott some 30 American ships may be subjected to Arab boycott.

As can be seen, outside attempts, no matter how well intentioned, to compel one or more of the Middle Eastern countries to follow a certain behavior have wide repercussions. I might add that while resentments against such pressure in Arab-Israel matters have direct repercussions on our interests in 10 Arab countries from Morocco to the Persian Gulf, the sympathy for these 10 nations is inevitably widespread throughout Africa and Asia. This is a critical juncture in the history of those two continents. Just when the young Afro-Asian nations and particularly the Arab nations appear for the first time to be becoming aware of the fact that the Communists have been falsely posing as patriotic nationalists, it ill behooves us, through an appearance of placing "strings" on our aid, to incur the deep resentment or hostility not only of the 10 Arab nations but of their natural friends, the states of Africa and Asia. In fact, we do not believe it is in Israel's long-range interest that such enmity be aroused and choosing of sides precipitated throughout the Afro-Asian region.

In our view, avoidance of coercive tactics against Israel's neighbors is in Israel's interest. In just over a decade, Israel has quadrupled its exports. Its unfavorable trade balance has steadily been reduced. Israel's Gross National Product per capita is now more than twice that of any of its neighbors and even exceeds that of Netherlands and Italy. While foreign funds from various sources at an average rate of nearly \$1,000,000 per day have been partly responsible, primary responsibility for this progress lies with the Israeli people themselves, their ingenuity, industriousness, and devotion to purpose. Parenthetically, I should note that our government has been consistent in its support to Israel. We have extended to Israel with its population of under 2,000,000 a sizeable total of various types of assistance, including PL 480. Such assistance, as you know, is continuing. Conditions have thus far been sufficiently favorable to allow Israel to make great strides. In our view it would be a grave mistake to have that progress disturbed by actions which can only stir up area tensions to Israel's detriment.

As you know, it is the view of our Government that the tensions of the Middle East can more

effectively be treated by concerted international action than by unilateral action on the part of the United States. That was the essence of President Eisenhower's address before the United Nations General Assembly during the fateful Middle East crisis in the Summer of 1958. Such progress as has been recorded since that time has been in large measure due to such international agencies as the United Nations Emergency Force and the United Nations Truce Supervisory Organization. With specific reference to the restrictions on Israel shipping in the Suez Canal, the United Nations Secretary General has actively sought a solution. Although his efforts have not succeeded and have in fact met with a number of setbacks, the Secretary General as recently as April 8 reported his continued interest in the problem and his unextinguished hope that a solution may yet be found. Our Government is giving these endeavors its fullest support.

Although this letter is somewhat lengthy, I hope it will prove helpful to you in facilitating understanding of these important questions. In particular I hope it will make clear the reasons why those of us who deal with these problems on a day-to-day basis feel strongly that no actions should be taken which will exacerbate tensions in the Middle East which are clearly harmful to the long-range interests of the United States, Israel and the entire Free World.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON  
*The Acting Secretary*

## **U.S. Restates Principles Affecting Policy Toward Merchant Marine**

*The Department of State released on May 6 (press release 251) the following exchange of letters between Acting Secretary Dillon and President George Meany of the AFL-CIO.*

### **MR. DILLON TO MR. MEANY**

MAY 6, 1960

DEAR MR. MEANY: I have just received your letter of May 5 enclosing the statement recently adopted by the AFL-CIO Executive Council with respect to boycott measures of the Arab League.

With reference to the last paragraph of your

letter regarding appropriate action which the Department of State might take under the circumstances, I enclose a statement of basic principles which actuate United States foreign policy affecting the American Merchant Marine.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS DILLON  
*Acting Secretary*

Mr. GEORGE MEANY,  
*President, AFL-CIO,*  
815 16th Street, NW.,  
Washington 6, D.C.

### **STATEMENT OF POLICY** *May 6, 1960*

1. As a matter of settled policy, the United States supports the principle of freedom of the seas and free access to foreign ports and facilities. The Department has constantly sought to facilitate the normal pursuit of international commerce by vessels of United States registry.

2. The United States Government has long and unequivocally maintained the principle that there should be freedom of transit through the Suez Canal for all nations. This policy has been publicly emphasized on numerous occasions, and was specifically reiterated by the Secretary of State during his address before the United Nations General Assembly on September 17, 1959.<sup>1</sup>

3. The United States Government protests as a matter of policy discriminatory actions or practices with respect to international trade which adversely affect United States firms, vessels and citizens. The Department will continue to pursue, by all appropriate and effective means, every avenue whereby private American interests in international trade may be fully safeguarded, and restored.

4. With respect to Arab trade restrictions arising out of the Arab-Israel conflict, the Department of State reemphasizes that our Government neither recognizes nor condones the Arab boycott, which includes the black-listing of United States flag vessels in part because of prior calls at Israeli ports. Every appropriate opportunity will be utilized, on a continuing basis, to reemphasize this fundamental position to the Governments concerned. At the same time, every suitable occasion will be employed both within and outside the United Nations, to facilitate progress towards a

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Oct. 5, 1959, p. 467.

solution of the basic Arab-Israel conflict from which the Arab boycott arises.

5. The United States Navy in February 1960 discontinued the use of a clause formerly employed in contracting procedures for the delivery of oil to U.S. naval installations abroad, lest this clause, which was designed to assure the efficient operation of the Fleet, be misconstrued as acquiescence in the Arab boycott. Regarding transportation of PL 480 cargoes, restrictive clauses have in certain instances been included in ship charters by foreign countries which purchase the surpluses in this country and make their own shipping arrangements directly with private carriers. No United States Government agency is a party to these contracts. Consistent with the policy that no United States agency condone the Arab boycott, the Department will continue its efforts to do what it can to end the application of these restrictive clauses with respect to U.S. flag vessels under charter to foreign countries.

6. Regarding treatment of United States citizens abroad, including American seamen, it is of course mandatory on this Department to do everything possible to assure equal treatment and freedom from harassment for all our citizens in foreign countries. United States diplomatic and consular officers have standing instructions to extend every appropriate assistance to our citizens who may encounter difficulties. In several recent instances American seamen experienced difficulties at ports in the United Arab Republic. Our consular officers made every effort to assist the crews of these vessels, and were in fact able to be of material help. The Department has renewed its standing instructions to its consular officers to be on the alert to assist in settling grievances regarding treatment abroad of American seamen or other American citizens which are brought to their attention.

7. As a matter of basic procedure, the Department gives full consideration to all communications from private American groups with respect to problems affecting the conduct of United States foreign relations. In accordance with this procedure, it has been and will continue to be, the intention of the Department of State to give full consideration to all communications from the Seafarers International Union, other affected maritime unions and other interested groups. The Department will consult with the AFL-CIO and its maritime affiliates on future developments af-

fecting American vessels and seamen in the areas concerned.

In the light of the foregoing basic principles and in conformity with the fundamental national interest, the Department gives assurances that it will undertake to investigate fully the grievances of the Seafarers International Union and, through appropriate diplomatic action with the foreign countries involved, to renew its efforts to assure freedom of the seas and to protect the interests of our shipping and seamen now being discriminated against by the Arab boycott and black-listing policy.

#### MR. MEANY TO MR. DILLO

MAY 5, 1960

Honorable DOUGLAS DILLON, *Acting Secretary of State*  
U.S. Department of State  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have the honor to transmit to you the resolution<sup>2</sup> adopted by the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO on Wednesday, May 4, pledging full support to the maritime affiliates of the AFL-CIO in their protest against the black-listing of American flagships and the boycott policy being pursued by the Arab boycott organization of the Arab League.

You will note that the resolution further expresses the support by the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO of the direct actions taken by the Seafarers International Union, supported by the International Longshoremen's Association in the New York port.

I have taken the liberty of forwarding the resolution to you for the information of the Department of State and for such action as may be appropriate under the circumstances.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEANY  
*President*

#### ICA Study Group Visits Belgian Congo

Press release 236 dated May 2

An International Cooperation Administration study group consisting of Margaret Joy Tibbetts, Glenn Lehmann, and Joseph St. Lawrence has arrived in Léopoldville at the invitation of the General Executive Council of the Belgian Congo in Léopoldville and the Belgian Government. The study group wishes to acquaint itself with the future problems and needs of an independent

<sup>2</sup> Not printed here.

Congo with a view to studying possible future means, within the limits of available resources, by which U.S. technical assistance could be of value to the Government of the Congo.

At present the U.S. Government, through ICA in agreement with governments concerned, is conducting programs of technical assistance in 13 countries and territories in Africa. Miss Tibbetts, Mr. Lehmann, and Mr. St. Lawrence are serving in Washington with the International Cooperation Administration, the agency of the U.S. Government charged with administering programs of technical assistance.

## Iranian Archeological Congress Concludes Meeting

*Following are remarks made by Loy W. Henderson, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration, at the closing session of the Fourth Congress of Iranian Art and Archeology at Washington, D.C., on May 3. Mr. Henderson represented President Eisenhower at the Congress.*<sup>1</sup>

Press release 242 dated May 4

On behalf of the United States Government it is my privilege to congratulate the organizers and participants of the Fourth Congress of Iranian Art and Archeology as that eventful and memorable Congress comes to a close. Special tribute is due Dr. Pope [Arthur Upham Pope, director of the Fourth Congress], Dr. Kuhnel [Ernst Kuhnel, chairman of the Fourth Congress], and others who have contributed so much to its success.

Delegates from far and near have given generously of their time in preparing for and attending this Congress and in participating in its discussions and deliberations. We are delighted

that so many of our friends from abroad have been present, and regret that circumstances have prevented many of the outstanding scholars of Iranian culture from coming. We know that they are with us in spirit.

The American people are honored that the United States was selected as the site for the Fourth Congress. We are proud of our collections of Iranian artistic and archeological treasures and are happy that scholars and artists from various parts of the world have been able to enjoy them with us.

Persian culture with its great richness has for many generations broadened and deepened concepts of beauty throughout the world. Appreciation of man's handiwork like that of nature cannot be confined by national boundaries. The love and understanding of beauty brings pleasure to the hearts and minds of all peoples and serves as a common bond to unite them. This has been amply demonstrated in your warm associations and stimulating exchanges during the past days.

The recent revelation by outstanding scholars, a number of whom have attended this Congress, of some of the secrets hitherto hidden in ancient Persian art forms—in rugs, paintings, and architecture—is giving us a wider comprehension of the grandeur of this ancient civilization and a deeper appreciation of the richness of its heritage to us.

We are all debtors to the scholars in the field of Iranian art and archeology. Through the sharing of concepts of beauty and culture they are making a significant contribution to the promotion of values of brotherhood—to an understanding and tolerance so essential to the preservation of world peace.

I know that I am reflecting the views not only of our Government but also of the American people when I express appreciation in particular of the achievements of the members of this Congress. We wish all of you an agreeable return journey to your homes.

<sup>1</sup> For background, see BULLETIN of May 2, 1960, p. 713.



## President Urges Congress To Act on Mutual Security Legislation

*On May 3 President Eisenhower sent to the Congress a message<sup>1</sup> in which he urged action on certain pending legislation. Following is the portion of the message dealing with the Mutual Security Program.*

During most of our Nation's history, our growth was strongly influenced by two unique conditions. First, for more than a century and a half two great oceans protected us from the violent struggles of the Old World. Although in recent years we became engaged in two global wars, our relative isolation gave us months in which to assemble, train, and equip our forces deliberately and unmolested. Second, from the very beginning, our Nation's rapid expansion was encouraged by commercial and financial assistance from the nations of Europe. These countries provided us with valuable skills and the capital needed to accelerate the development of our resources, industries, and commerce.

These conditions have radically changed. America emerged from World War II as the mightiest nation in a free world that, in the main, was exhausted and crippled. Soon thereafter we came to realize that new weapons of great power, speed and range has markedly reduced the value of our ocean shield. Our homeland, in any future major war, would be a prime target, and our warning time against surprise attack would be minutes, not months. Our security cannot now be achieved by methods and a level of effort believed adequate only a few years ago.

In a world, moreover, in which an aggressive ideology drives ceaselessly to destroy human freedom, it is now the United States to which aspiring free peoples, particularly in underdeveloped areas, must look, as America once did to others, for the technical knowledge and financial assist-

ance needed to help them strengthen their economies and protect their independence.

Such changes as these gave rise to our mutual security program, one of the most necessary and successful enterprises America has undertaken throughout her history. Started more than a decade ago, the program helped to save Greece, forestalled economic collapse in Turkey and Western Europe, supported the countries of the SEATO Alliance, sustained the strength and independence of South Korea and the Republic of China, and made real progress, in underdeveloped nations on five continents, in combating disease, poverty, and suffering, and thus has strengthened the resistance of those areas to Communist penetration, propaganda, and subversion. Clear it is that the mutual security program provides the surest path by which America can lead to and sustain a durable peace with justice.

Such a program serves the Nation at large rather than any particular locality, section or group. Only with difficulty, therefore, can its great rewards be measured by individual communities and citizens. It inevitably follows that in the annual contests over the public use of tax revenues, there is a tendency to bypass the needs of this vital security program in favor of domestic projects that, urged by special groups, achieve a measure of support far greater than their overall value to the Nation warrants. Understandable this tendency is, but I deem it a great disservice to America to indulge it. The security of our country obviously demands that our mutual security program be carried forward at an adequate level.

I have asked new appropriations of \$4.175 billions for this program for the 1961 fiscal year. Nearly half of this—a sum one-twentieth of our own defense budget—is to assist the military forces of the free world, comprising 5 million soldiers, 2,200 combatant ships, and 30,000 aircraft. I need not remind the Congress of the low cost at which this force for freedom is sustained as compared to the cost of an aircraft carrier, a squadron of jet bombers, or an Army or Marine Corps division in our own defense structure.

<sup>1</sup> H. Doc. 385, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

Of the other parts of the program, one-third is for economic assistance required to help sustain these large forces abroad. The remainder consists of loans, technical assistance, and grants to help underdeveloped nations. These are the funds that spell the difference between hopeless stagnation and progress for hundreds of millions of people who, with us, believe in freedom.

Congressional approval of these funds for mutual security will profoundly benefit our people. To our allies and to others with whom we discuss the great issues of our times, it will signify that a united America has not wearied in the discharge of its responsibilities, and that we are unshakable in our determination to attain a world order in which men are free to pursue their goals in peace. And I emphasize once again that, as we strive to build the kind of world in which America believes, our adversaries are not all included in the single word "communism." They are distress and privation as well, and also the desperation of peoples when they realize that, lacking outside help, they struggle in vain to better their lives. Widespread chaos and misery cannot provide a world climate in which our free Republic can prosper and remain secure. There is for America no higher purpose or greater need than to measure up to her world leadership responsibilities.

I am keenly aware of the contention that, because of an adverse balance of payments and because of certain failures in administration, America should curtail these mutual security efforts. We must, and do, strive for greater efficiency. Likewise, we do have a problem with balance of payments, but the way to meet this is by positive actions which expand exports. Neither difficulty can be met by withdrawing from our responsibilities for world leadership and from partnership in the protection of freedom. We need—in our own interests—greater human progress and economic growth throughout the world. We cannot achieve these by an assault either on mutual security or on liberal trade policies.

I congratulate the Congress for its actions thus far on the funds for mutual security in the authorizing legislation; and I reaffirm the imperative necessity of providing the appropriations that the authorization would allow.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 3, 1960

## Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

### 86th Congress, 2d Session

- Great Lakes Pilotage. Hearings before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on S. 3019, a bill to provide for certain pilotage requirements in the navigation of U.S. waters of the Great Lakes and for other purposes. February 23, 1960. 95 pp.
- International Development Association. Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. 3074, to provide for U.S. participation in the IDA. March 18-21, 1960. 122 pp.
- Mutual Security Act of 1960. Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. 3058, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. March 22-April 5, 1960. 672 pp.
- Annual Report of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. Message from the President, together with the report covering the Corporation's activities for the year ended December 31, 1959. H. Doc. 376. April 11, 1960. 106 pp.
- Immigration and Naturalization. Report of the Senate Judiciary Committee made by its Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization pursuant to S. Res. 55, as amended and extended, 86th Congress, 1st session, together with supplemental views. S. Rept. 1272. April 14, 1960. 8 pp.
- Providing for Promotion of Economic and Social Development in the Ryukyu Islands. Report to accompany H.R. 1157. H. Rept. 1517. April 14, 1960. 22 pp.
- Promoting Foreign Trade of United States in Grapes and Plums. Report to accompany S. 1857. S. Rept. 1274. April 19, 1960. 7 pp.
- Requiring Rebuilding Work on Domestic Vessels To Be Done Entirely in U.S. Shipyards. Report to accompany S. 3189. S. Rept. 1279. April 19, 1960. 9 pp.
- Operations of the Development Loan Fund. Fourteenth report by the House Government Operations Committee. H. Rept. 1526. April 19, 1960. 35 pp.
- Pilotage Requirements for Vessels Navigating U.S. Waters of the Great Lakes. Report to accompany S. 3019. S. Rept. 1284. April 21, 1960. 14 pp.
- The Mutual Security Act of 1960. Report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. 3058. S. Rept. 1286. April 22, 1960. 65 pp.
- Foreign Commerce Study. Interim report to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by special staff on the study of U.S. foreign commerce. April 25, 1960. 71 pp. [Committee print]
- Extension of Export Control Act of 1949. Report to accompany H.R. 10550. S. Rept. 1287. April 25, 1960. 11 pp.
- Law of the Sea Conventions. Report to accompany Ex. J to N, inclusive, 86th Congress, 1st session. S. Ex. Rept. 5. April 27, 1960. 11 pp.
- Authorizing the Loan of One Submarine to Canada and the Extension of a Loan of a Naval Vessel to the Government of the Republic of China. Report to accompany H.R. 9465. S. Rept. 1298. April 28, 1960. 4 pp.
- Restoration of Freedom to Captive Nations. Report to accompany H. Con. Res. 633. H. Rept. 1562. May 2, 1960. 5 pp.
- Suspension of Duties on Metal Scrap. Report to accompany H.R. 11748. H. Rept. 1565. May 2, 1960. 4 pp.
- Report to Congress on the Mutual Security Program for the First Half of Fiscal Year 1960. H. Doc. 373. May 2, 1960. 64 pp.
- Temporary Suspension of Duty on Certain Amorphous Graphite. Report to accompany H.R. 1217. S. Rept. 1332. May 3, 1960. 3 pp.
- Temporary Tariff Treatment of Chicory. Report to accompany H.R. 9308. S. Rept. 1333. May 3, 1960. 4 pp.

## North Atlantic Council Holds Ministerial Meeting at Istanbul

*The North Atlantic Council held its spring Ministerial Meeting at Istanbul May 2-4. Following are texts of a message from President Eisenhower which was read by Secretary Herter at the opening session on May 2, a final communique issued on May 4, and statements made by Secretary Herter upon his arrival at Istanbul on April 30, at the conclusion of the meeting on May 4, and upon his return to Washington on May 6, together with a list of the members of the U.S. delegation.*

### MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

As the NATO Ministerial Council convenes for its twenty-fifth session since NATO's founding, I should like to recall its original purpose, to emphasize once more its continuing necessity, and to define anew its challenging tasks.

Eleven years ago our nations joined in a solemn pact of interdependence. We recognized that only by cooperating as free peoples, subjecting our individual preference to the common interest, could we ward off threatening danger. For the threat was real and immediate.

For my own country, the decision to join such a pact was epochal. We overcame our historic aversion to permanent alliances and, in important facets, agreed to merge our destiny with that of other free and like-minded nations of the Atlantic area. This decision has been ratified by the overwhelming approval of the American people of whatever party or political faith. It has grown into the strongest peace-time coalition in all history. It has come to have a meaning for its members far transcending the initial crisis which gave it birth.

In two weeks, I shall meet at Paris, together with other Western leaders, with the Premier of the USSR.

We approach these Paris talks with a sincere desire to do all possible to reduce the tensions and dangers that now exist. Yet we cannot reasonably anticipate any quick or spectacular results. This meeting will be one more in what may prove a long succession of diplomatic exchanges dealing with some of the most difficult problems of our era. These are not susceptible to early solution. We can, at best, hope to make some modest progress towards our goals.

In this period of prolonged negotiation, I hope that all the NATO governments and their peoples will redouble efforts toward maintaining our strength, unity, and firmness of purpose.

We can negotiate successfully only if we are resolute and united, and if that resolution and unity are manifest to the Soviets. Any evidence of weakness or division among ourselves can only undermine our diplomacy and diminish its effectiveness.

If our negotiations with the Soviets do not prosper, we will have even more reason to look to our combined NATO forces as our greatest insurance against aggression.

If these negotiations do create some hope of reducing the risk of hostility, our efforts to enhance NATO's material and moral strength and cohesion will be the more needed—in order to meet the challenge of intensifying competition with the Communists throughout the world.

It is thus apparent today, even more than when our NATO treaty was signed, that our alliance is responsive to vital and enduring needs—a permanent community of free peoples, menacing no one, concerting its efforts only to advance the common good, evolving to deal ever more effectively with the problems and opportunities of the new decade.

To meet these problems and opportunities, Secretary Herter proposed at your Ministerial meet-

ing last December<sup>1</sup> that NATO engage in long-range planning for the 1960's. We are making intensive preparations for effective United States participation in this planning, as I trust that all of you are doing. To move toward our common goals will demand the concerted planning and consecrated effort of all our nations.

As one who has been closely associated with NATO since its beginning, I realize fully the differences of approach that are inevitable in any alliance of free nations. Yet our potential strength is the greater because we *are* free. To realize this fact, we have only to contrast our essentially trivial differences with the common stake and opportunities that we have in freedom. No dictatorship can hope to generate the power, both material and moral, which free peoples acting in unison can wield.

To mobilize this power, we must dedicate ourselves anew to the task of uniting and strengthening our NATO community so that it can effectively meet the challenges not only of the months but of the decades which lie ahead.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

#### TEXT OF COMMUNIQUE

Press release 243 dated May 4

The North Atlantic Council held its spring ministerial meeting in Istanbul from May 2nd-4th.

The Council took stock of the situation on the eve of the Summit Meeting. The results of its exchange of views may be summarized as follows:

(A) The Council welcomes the prospect of negotiations with the Soviet Union, and hopes that they will lead to improved international relations. The unity of the Alliance is a condition of progress towards this end.

(B) All members of the Alliance share the aim of general and complete disarmament, to be achieved by stages under effective international control, and support the proposals of the Western negotiators at Geneva to this end. These proposals in their view provide the best means of carrying out the United Nations Resolution of 20th November, 1959;<sup>2</sup> they regret the unwilling-

<sup>1</sup> For Secretary Herter's arrival statement and communiqués issued on Dec. 17 and Dec. 22, 1959, see *BULLETIN* of Jan. 4, 1960, p. 3, and Jan. 11, 1960, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup> U.N. doc. A/RES/1738(XIV) (A/C.1/L.234); for text, see *ibid.*, Nov. 23, 1959, p. 768.

ness which the Soviet side has so far shown to discuss specific practical measures of disarmament.

(C) While desiring a true international detente, the Atlantic Alliance cannot be satisfied with a formula of "peaceful coexistence" under cover of which attacks continue to be made on individual members of the Alliance. Detente, like peace, is indivisible. Thus, the efforts of Soviet propaganda to discredit the Federal Republic of Germany and the governments of certain other NATO countries are inimical to the Alliance as a whole and inconsistent with a real improvement of international relations.

(D) The Council reaffirms the view that the solution of the problem of Germany can only be found in reunification on the basis of self-determination. It recalls its Declaration of 16th December, 1958,<sup>3</sup> and once again expresses its determination to protect the freedom of the people of West Berlin.

The Council heard reports on the topics likely to be discussed at the Summit Meeting. After a full discussion, it expressed its entire agreement with the common positions of the United States, France and the United Kingdom as worked out in consultation with their Allies. It expressed its satisfaction with the system of continuous consultation between all members of the Alliance which has been developed.

The Council also examined the Secretary General's report on the working of the Alliance. It welcomed the progress accomplished in various fields and reaffirmed its determination to continue its efforts in the field of political and economic cooperation and solidarity which is so necessary for the maintenance of peace and defense of freedom.

All members of the Council reaffirmed their faith in NATO and welcomed the emphasis given in President Eisenhower's message to the long-term planning of the Alliance.

#### STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY HERTER

##### Arrival Statement, Istanbul, April 30

Press release 231 dated April 30

I am glad to be in Turkey. The people of this great republic play a valiant role in the defense of the rich traditions which have shaped our civi-

<sup>3</sup> For text, see *ibid.*, Jan. 5, 1959, p. 4.



lization. We in America are proud to be associated with you in this common cause.

Within the councils of NATO we seek the frank and honest advice of one another on the issues we face together in the defense of our freedom and in the quest for a just, lasting, and honorable peace. Here in Istanbul next week, we will seek the benefit of that advice, particularly with regard to the summit meeting in Paris on May 16.

We, for our part, look ahead to the Paris meeting with a sense of realism born of experience. We hope for progress but hold no illusions. For our ultimate objective goes beyond the mere maintenance of the long-familiar uneasy state of conflict recently disguised under slogans of "peaceful coexistence." What we seek is a positive state of well-being in which men can pursue their rightful aspirations in freedom and in peace.

At best the road to this goal will be long and difficult. Today, the sense of crisis appears less imminent than a year ago. But for us to confuse now or in the future the appearance of relaxation in tension with real progress toward solutions of international issues would be a disservice to the cause of peace.

We in NATO must, therefore, continue to strengthen the ties that bind us. We must continue to build the collective strength of our defenses. This is the only sound course for us to follow. We have done so in the past. I am confident we shall do so in the future.

#### **Statement at Conclusion of Meeting, May 4**

Press release 241 dated May 4

I wish to express my deep gratitude for the hospitality extended by the Government of Turkey and the courtesy shown us by the people of Istanbul.

Ours has been a significant meeting. It has shown once again the extraordinary unity existing among the 15 free and independent members of NATO. I am heartened and encouraged by this fact.

I have benefited immeasurably from the advice freely and honestly given by our friends, particularly in regard to the summit meeting on May 16.

The United States will go to that meeting fully aware that the process of resolving the many outstanding problems will be protracted. It will require much patience. It may well take many

forms. It is therefore particularly important that we in NATO not only maintain but improve our unity and the collective strength of our defenses.

Both patience and determination on our part are not all that is required. The Soviet Government has to come to the realization that the determination of free men to safeguard their freedom cannot be subdued. It must also understand that the people of the world want and deserve more than a struggle for domination under the guise of what they have chosen to call "peaceful coexistence." If the forthcoming meeting demonstrates that the Soviet Union now understands these basic facts, we should be able to make a start toward the solution of some of our major problems.

#### **Arrival Statement, Washington, May 6**

Press release 252 dated May 6

I return from the Foreign Ministers Conferences of the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) held in Tehran<sup>4</sup> and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) held in Istanbul. On the return route 1 day was spent in Athens for fruitful discussions with Greek officials and a pleasant visit with Their Gracious Majesties the King and Queen of Greece.

Both the NATO and CENTO conferences were eminently successful. They afforded opportunities for thorough exchanges of views on specific problems and tasks relating to the alliances themselves and on the international situation generally, with particular reference to the forthcoming summit meeting in Paris.

Marked unity was demonstrated at both conferences. All participants were determined to maintain strong defenses until the hoped-for day when general and complete disarmament and international arrangements for keeping the peace can be achieved.

The CENTO and NATO conferences gave their approval to the Western approaches to the summit. While welcoming the constructive nature of the Western positions, the Ministers agreed that exaggerated hopes for agreement should not be entertained.

A significant outcome of the discussions was the unanimous agreement that a *détente*, though welcome, cannot be a true *détente* while the Soviet

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, May 16, 1960, p. 801.

Union continues its attacks on some members of the alliance and seeks to sow dissension between them. To echo the words of the NATO communique, *détente*, like peace, is indivisible.

#### **U.S. DELEGATION**

The Department of State announced on April 25 (press release 212) that the following are the principal members of the U.S. delegation to the ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at Istanbul from May 2 to 4, 1960.

##### *U.S. Representative*

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter

##### *U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Council and European Regional Organizations*

Ambassador W. Randolph Burgess

##### *Senior Advisers*

Livingston T. Merchant, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs

Theodore C. Achilles, Counselor of the Department of State

Andrew H. Berding, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs

Philip J. Farley, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Disarmament and Atomic Energy

John N. Irwin II, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs

G. Lewis Jones, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs

Foy D. Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs

Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., Alternate U.S. Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Council

Gerard C. Smith, Assistant Secretary of State for Policy Planning

Fletcher Warren, Ambassador to Turkey

#### **President Names U.S. Members of Shrimp Commission**

The White House (Augusta, Ga.) announced on April 20 that the President had on that date appointed the following to be members of the U.S. section of the Commission for the Conservation of Shrimp in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico:<sup>1</sup>

John C. Ferguson -

Robert M. Ingle

Donald L. McKernan, Director, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Department of the Interior

<sup>1</sup> Established pursuant to a convention with Cuba signed on Aug. 15, 1958; for text, see BULLETIN of Apr. 20, 1959, p. 566.

#### **United States Delegations to International Conferences**

##### **13th World Health Assembly**

The Department of State announced on April 29 (press release 229) that the President has designated Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as chairman of the U.S. delegation to the 13th World Health Assembly, which is scheduled to convene at Geneva on May 3.

The President also designated Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Horace E. Henderson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, as delegates and the following as alternate delegates:

Frank B. Berry, M.D., Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health and Medical)

Lowell T. Coggeshall, M.D., Dean, Division of Biological Sciences, University of Chicago

H. van Zile Hyde, M.D., Assistant to the Surgeon General for International Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Richard K. C. Lee, M.D., President, Board of Health, State of Hawaii

Other members of the delegation include:

##### *Advisers*

Guillermo Arbona, M.D., Secretary of Health of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico

Eugene P. Campbell, M.D., Chief, Public Health Division, International Cooperation Administration

Geoffrey Edsall, M.D., Director of Immunology Division, Army Medical Service, Graduate School, Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.

E. Ross Jenney, M.D., Assistant Chief, Division of International Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Berwyn Mattison, M.D., Executive Secretary, American Public Health Association

Cleon A. Nafe, M.D., Associate Professor of Surgery, Indiana University Medical School

Christopher Parnall, Jr., M.D., Administrator, Rochester General Hospital, Rochester, N.Y.

M. Allen Pond, Office of the Special Assistant for Health and Medical Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Edward J. Rowell, American Consulate General, Geneva, Switzerland

William Thomas Sowder, M.D., Florida State Health Officer

Lawrence R. Wyatt, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Department of State

##### *Secretary of Delegation*

David B. Ortman, Office of International Conferences, Department of State

## TREATY INFORMATION

### Temporary Waiver of Some Provisions in U.S.-Iran Trade Agreement

Press release 218 dated April 27

#### DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

On April 12, 1960, the U.S. Government, through the American Embassy at Tehran, exchanged notes with the Government of Iran in which the Government of the United States agreed not to invoke article VI of the United States-Iran Reciprocal Trade Agreement of 1943<sup>1</sup> with respect to the temporary imposition by Iran of commercial profits taxes on certain products on which Iran had given tariff concessions to the United States in the agreement. The Government of Iran had requested U.S. agreement to these taxes because of Iran's balance-of-payments problem. The exchange of notes covers a period not to exceed 6 months immediately following the date of the exchange. The original agreement was signed on April 8, 1943.

Under the terms of the notes, the taxes in question shall not be imposed on products of the United States at rates higher than those at which they are imposed on products of any third country. In no case shall the combined duty and commercial profits taxes exceed the ad valorem rate specified for the respective products in the notes.

The text of the U.S. note is attached. The Iranian reply is identical in substance.

#### TEXT OF U.S. NOTE

DEAR MR. MINISTER: I refer to recent discussions with respect to the serious balance of payments situation confronting Iran. It is my understanding that these discussions have resulted in the following agreement:

1. The Government of Iran considers it necessary during the next six months temporarily to impose its commercial profits taxes on the importation of the following products of the United States provided for in Schedule I to the Trade Agreement between the United States and Iran, signed April 8, 1943, but in no case shall the combined duty and commercial

profits taxes, or the ad valorem equivalent of such combined duty and taxes in cases in which a specific rate is involved, exceed the ad valorem rate specified for the respective products:

Tariff Number	Description	Rate
868 B	Radio receiving sets, including phonographs	
	1. Up to 5,000 rials (\$65)	25 percent
	5,000-10,000 rials (\$65-\$130)	50 percent
	More than 10,000 rials (\$130)	75 percent
868 D	Television receivers	
	Up to 20,000 rials (\$261)	25 percent
	20,000 rials or more	50 percent
890 A	Passenger cars including sport models	
	Up to 200,000 rials (\$2614)	35 percent
	200,000-300,000 rials (\$2614-\$3921)	50 percent
	300,000 (\$3921) or more	75 percent

2. Such commercial profits taxes shall not be imposed on products of the United States at rates higher than those at which these taxes are imposed on products of any third country.

3. In view of the serious balance of payments situation of Iran the Government of the United States, during the period of six months immediately following the date of this note, will not invoke the provisions of Article VI of the Trade Agreement in respect of the commercial profit taxes specified above.

The Government of the United States of America will consider that this note, together with your note in reply, indicating concurrence of the Government of Iran in respect to the matter set forth above, constitute an agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran to enter into force on the date of your reply note.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD T. WAILES

His Excellency  
HASSAN ALI MANSUR,  
Minister of Commerce,  
Ministry of Commerce,  
Tehran.

### Current Actions

#### MULTILATERAL

#### Cultural Relations

Agreement on the importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials, and protocol. Done at Lake Success November 22, 1950. Entered into force May 21, 1952.<sup>1</sup>

Acceptance deposited: Denmark, April 5, 1960.

#### Shipping

Convention on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consulta-

<sup>1</sup> 58 Stat. 1322.

<sup>1</sup> Not in force for the United States.

tive Organization. Signed at Geneva March 6, 1948. Entered into force March 17, 1958. TIAS 4044. Acceptance deposited: Bulgaria, April 5, 1960.

### Telecommunications

Telegraph regulations (Geneva revision, 1958) annexed to the international telecommunication convention of December 22, 1952 (TIAS 3266), with appendixes and final protocol. Done at Geneva November 29, 1958. Entered into force January 1, 1960. TIAS 4390.

*Notification of approval:* Laos, March 21, 1960.

Radio regulations, with appendixes, annexed to the international telecommunication convention, 1959. Done at Geneva December 21, 1959.<sup>2</sup>

*Notification of approval:* Iran, March 14, 1960.

## BILATERAL

### India

Agricultural commodities agreement under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 455; 7 U.S.C. 1701-1709), with exchange of notes. Signed at Washington May 4, 1960. Entered into force May 4, 1960.

### Iran

Agreement providing that the United States will not invoke article VI of reciprocal trade agreement of 1943 (58 Stat. 1322) with respect to temporary imposition by Iran of commercial profits taxes on certain products. Effected by exchange of notes at Tehran April 12, 1960. Entered into force April 12, 1960.

### Japan

Agreement relating to a program for the assembly and manufacture in Japan of F-104 type aircraft by Japanese industry. Effected by exchange of notes at Tokyo April 15, 1960. Entered into force April 15, 1960.

### Turkey

Agreement amending the agreement of December 27, 1949, as amended (TIAS 2111 and 3737), for the establishment of the U.S. Educational Commission in Turkey. Effected by exchange of notes at Ankara February 1, 1960. Entered into force February 1, 1960.

## DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

### Organization of Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs<sup>1</sup>

Department circular 355 dated April 26

#### 1. Purpose

The purposes of this circular are (1) to announce the reorganization of the Bureau of International Cultural Relations and its redesignation as the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, and (2) to establish components of the new organization.

<sup>2</sup> Not in force.

<sup>3</sup> Department circular 329 dated June 15, 1959, is canceled.

#### 2. Background

The Bureau of International Cultural Relations was established, effective June 1, 1959, in recognition of the need for greater emphasis on the international cultural relations of the United States. The Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations heads the Bureau. He is responsible for the coordination of the wide variety of international cultural activities which are conducted by the several Government agencies and for the direction of the cultural programs of the Department. Experience since the establishment of the Bureau has revealed the advisability of modifying the organizational structure to: (1) give greater importance to the function of planning and developing the educational exchange and cultural programs of the Department; (2) make more manageable the heavy burden of operational responsibilities; and (3) provide the Special Assistant with a means to accomplish the two related but separate responsibilities of coordination and direction of operations.

#### 3. Organizational Changes

3.1 Effective with the pay period beginning April 17, 1960, the Bureau of International Cultural Relations (CU) is reorganized and renamed the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU).

3.2 Within the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the following changes are made:

a. The "Policy and Coordination Staff", the "Plans and Development Staff", "Office of Cultural Exchange" and the "Office of Educational Exchange" are established.

b. The "Executive and Reports Staff" replaces the Executive Staff and the Program Reporting Staff.

c. The UNESCO [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization] Relations Staff is redesignated "Secretariat-United States National Commission for UNESCO".

d. The Cultural Policy and Development Staff, the Cultural Presentations Staff and the International Educational Exchange Service are abolished.

3.3 The East-West Contacts Program and Staff will be transferred to the Bureau of European Affairs. CU will retain responsibility for approval of the performances of American groups touring under the President's Special International Program and for programming and selection of American and Soviet students exchanged with the Soviet Union under terms of the U.S.-USSR Exchange Agreement as well as student exchanges with the other Eastern European nations.

#### 4. Designation

Mr. Robert H. Thayer continues as head of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. Mr. Saxton Bradford will continue to serve as Deputy and will direct the operating programs of the Bureau under the supervision of the Special Assistant.

#### 5. Functions

5.1 *Office of the Special Assistant to the Secretary for the Coordination of International Educational and Cultural Relations*

a. Develops United States Government policy on, and



coordinates, all international cultural, educational and exchange of persons activities and the cultural aspects of training programs for foreign nationals.

b. Directs the Department's cultural and educational exchange programs.

#### 5.11 Policy and Coordination Staff

Serves as the body which assists the Special Assistant in the coordination aspects of the Bureau's functions; maintains liaison and consults with other Government agencies and with private foundations and other non-Government groups; provides advice and guidance in the establishment of priorities and other program considerations and information on plans and program activities both Governmental and private in the educational and cultural field.

#### 5.12 Secretariat of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange and the Advisory Committee on the Arts

Provides such staff functions as are necessary to enable the Advisory Commission and the Advisory Committee to fulfill their respective responsibilities as provided by law.

#### 5.13 Secretariat-United States National Commission for UNESCO

a. In consultation with the Plans and Development Staff, the National Commission and the Bureau of International Organization Affairs, develops policies governing substantive U.S. participation in the UNESCO program.

b. Coordinates activities incident to the participation of the United States in UNESCO.

c. Provides staff functions for the National Commission including services for its meetings, conference and travel arrangements.

#### 5.14 Executive and Reports Staff

Provides executive leadership and direction, and administers the organization, budget and fiscal, security, personnel and administrative activities of the Bureau. Issues all reports of the Bureau, including those required by legislation. Provides a clearing house of information involving the collection of information and preparation of reports about all Government and private activities in the international educational and cultural fields.

- a. Financial Management Branch
- b. Reports Branch
- c. Organization and Procedures Branch
- d. Administrative and Personnel Branch

#### 5.2 Plans and Development Staff

a. Plans are prepared by geographic area planning officers for the Department's educational and cultural activities, including exchange of persons, cultural presentations, multilateral cultural activities, cultural agreements and conventions, etc., and for the Department's assistance to private activities in this field. Develops a total educational and cultural program for each country and for regional cultural programs including those for OAS [Organization of American States], NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization], SEATO [Southeast Asia Treaty Organization], CENTO [Central Treaty Organization],

etc., taking into consideration the recommendations of overseas missions. Obtains political guidance from the geographic bureaus and program information from other elements of CU as a basis for planning.

b. Advisers in the Office of the Director (1) assemble information on the extent of educational and cultural resources within the United States and advise on the manner in which those resources are to be taken into account in planning the Department's educational and cultural activities, and (2) ensure an appropriate relationship between over-all U.S. cultural interests and programs and U.S. participation in UNESCO and other multilateral cultural programs in collaboration with the Secretariat-U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

c. The "Evaluation Branch" acquires, interprets and evaluates information on educational and cultural programs on a country-by-country basis for the purpose of appraising progress and effectiveness and giving guidance in formulating policies and plans.

#### 5.3 Office of Educational Exchange

Conducts, directly and by agreement or contract with public or private agencies, activities in the educational and cultural field which are academic in nature and involve programs for bringing selected persons from other countries to the United States for study, teaching, and research and for sending selected Americans abroad for similar purposes; administers a program to provide facilitative assistance to interchanges of privately financed individuals and groups.

#### 5.31 Operations Staff of the Board of Foreign Scholarships

Provides such staff functions as are necessary to enable the Board of Foreign Scholarships to fulfill its responsibilities under Public Law 584, 79th Congress.

#### 5.32 Student Division

Directs the exchange of persons programs which bring foreign nationals to the United States for study in American educational institutions and which send Americans abroad for study in foreign educational institutions.

- a. American Branch
- b. Foreign Branch

#### 5.33 Professional Division

Directs (1) the exchange of persons programs which bring foreign professional educators and scholars at the university level to lecture or to undertake research in the United States and instructors at the elementary and secondary school level to teach, and (2) programs which send the same type of American professional people abroad for these purposes; directs the establishment of Chairs in American Studies in foreign institutions as well as Seminars in American Studies overseas.

- a. Lecturers and Research Scholars Branch
- b. Teachers Branch

#### 5.4 Office of Cultural Exchange

Conducts, directly and by agreement or contract with public or private agencies, activities in the educational and cultural field other than those of an academic nature; conducts programs for bringing key persons from

other countries to the United States for travel, observation and specialized practical experience, and for sending carefully selected Americans abroad for similar purposes; sends American performing artists and athletic groups overseas under terms of the International Cultural Exchange and Trade Fair Participation Act of 1956, Public Law 860; administers a program for grants and professional services to American-sponsored schools in Latin America and assists American-sponsored schools in other areas of the world; and aids non-United States Government organizations, institutions and individuals here and abroad in undertaking exchange projects of their own which can further the national interest.

#### 5.41 Presentations Division

Administers the program which sends abroad on tour American artists, athletes, lecturers, instructors and demonstrators of American cultural achievement, as individuals or groups.

- a. Performing Artists Branch
- b. American Specialists Branch

#### 5.42 Leaders and Specialists Division

Directs exchange of persons programs for bringing foreign leaders of thought and opinion to the United States for programs of travel and observation and consultation and for bringing to the United States foreign specialists to participate under planned programs of practical experience; facilitates selected privately financed and sponsored exchange projects for eminent individuals or groups from other countries and similar projects abroad for Americans; supervises the operation of the Department's Reception Centers.

- a. Leaders Branch
- b. Foreign Specialists Branch
- c. Voluntary Leaders Branch

#### 5.43 Special Projects Division

Conducts activities in the areas of grantee orientation, follow-up programs, English language testing and teaching, and assistance on special program matters; administers programs to provide financial assistance, in part or in whole, to students and youth leaders on short-term educational travel interchanges; and administers the program of aid to American-sponsored schools abroad.

- a. American-Sponsored Schools Branch
- b. Facilitative Services Branch
- c. Education Travel Branch
- d. Special Activities Branch

### 6. Amendments to the Organization Manual, Regulations and Delegations of Authority

The Organization Manual, regulations and delegations of authority in the Department of State are being amended to reflect the changes incident to the reorganization herein above provided.

### Check List of Department of State Press Releases: May 2-8

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Releases issued prior to May 2 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 207 of April 22, 212 of April 25, 218 of April 27, 226 of April 28, 229 of April 29, and 231 of April 30.

No.	Date	Subject
*232	5/2	Cultural exchange (France).
233	5/2	Disarmament conference documents and transcripts.
234	5/2	Aid to Afghanistan in acquiring DC-6.
235	5/2	MSP report published.
236	5/2	ICA study group visits Belgian Congo.
*237	5/2	Revisions in program for visit of King of Nepal.
238	5/3	Herter: Mesage on Japanese centennial.
*239	5/3	Cultural exchange (Latin America).
†240	5/4	Herter: P.L. 480 agreement with India.
241	5/4	Herter: NATO Ministerial meeting.
242	5/4	Henderson: Iranian Archeological Congress.
243	5/4	NATO Ministerial meeting communique.
†244	5/5	Mann: "Sino-Soviet Bloc Trade and Its Implications for the United States."
*245	5/5	Bennett appointed ICA regional director for Near East and South Asia (biographic details).
†246	5/5	Penfield: "Africa: A New Situation Requiring New Responses."
247	5/5	Meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Inter-American Affairs (rewrite).
†248	5/6	Rubottom: "The Growing Importance of Educational Exchange in the American Republics."
249	5/6	U.S. note on plane shot down in Soviet Union.
*250	5/6	Cultural exchange (Chile).
251	5/6	Dillon-Meany letters on ship boycott.
252	5/6	Herter: return from CENTO and NATO meetings and visit to Greece.

\* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.

<b>Afghanistan.</b> U.S. Helps Afghan Airline Acquire Plane for Fleet . . . . .	831	<b>Middle East</b>	
<b>Africa.</b> ICA Study Group Visits Belgian Congo . . . . .	835	U.S. Restates Principles Affecting Policy Toward Merchant Marine (Dillon, Meany) . . . . .	834
<b>American Republics.</b> Inter-American Advisory Committee Holds Fourth Meeting . . . . .	815	Views on Freedom-of-Navigation Amendment to Mutual Security Act (Dillon) . . . . .	832
<b>Atomic Energy</b>		<b>Mutual Security</b>	
Disarmament: The Problem and the Prospects (Wilcox) . . . . .	820	ICA Study Group Visits Belgian Congo . . . . .	835
Research Program To Detect, Identify Underground Nuclear Tests Expanded . . . . .	819	Mutual Security, Its Principle and Programs (Eisenhower) . . . . .	811
<b>Aviation.</b> U.S. Helps Afghan Airline Acquire Plane for Fleet . . . . .	831	Mutual Security Report Emphasizes Problems of Economic Development . . . . .	814
<b>Congress, The</b>		President Urges Congress To Act on Mutual Security Legislation . . . . .	837
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy . . . . .	838	U.S. Helps Afghan Airline Acquire Plane for Fleet . . . . .	831
President Urges Congress To Act on Mutual Security Legislation . . . . .	837	Views on Freedom-of-Navigation Amendment to Mutual Security Act (Dillon) . . . . .	832
United States and Nepal Affirm Mutual Desire To Work for World Order Based on International Justice . . . . .	827	<b>Nepal.</b> United States and Nepal Affirm Mutual Desire To Work for World Order Based on International Justice (Eisenhower, King Mahendra, text of joint communique) . . . . .	827
Views on Freedom-of-Navigation Amendment to Mutual Security Act (Dillon) . . . . .	832	<b>Non-Self-Governing Territories.</b> ICA Study Group Visits Belgian Congo . . . . .	835
<b>Cuba.</b> President Names U.S. Members of Shrimp Commission . . . . .	842	<b>North Atlantic Treaty Organization.</b> North Atlantic Council Holds Ministerial Meeting at Istanbul (Eisenhower, Herter, text of communique) . . . . .	839
<b>Educational and Cultural Affairs</b>		<b>Presidential Documents</b>	
Iranian Archeological Congress Concludes Meeting (Henderson) . . . . .	836	Crown Prince and Princess of Japan To Visit U.S. . . . .	826
Organization of Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs . . . . .	844	Messages by President and Secretary on Japanese Centennial . . . . .	826
<b>Department and Foreign Service.</b> Organization of Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs . . . . .	844	Mutual Security, Its Principle and Programs . . . . .	811
<b>Disarmament</b>		Mutual Security Report Emphasizes Problems of Economic Development . . . . .	814
Disarmament: The Problem and the Prospects (Wilcox) . . . . .	820	North Atlantic Council Holds Ministerial Meeting at Istanbul . . . . .	839
Documents on Disarmament Talks Made Available for Reference . . . . .	819	President Urges Congress To Act on Mutual Security Legislation . . . . .	837
<b>Economic Affairs</b>		United States and Nepal Affirm Mutual Desire To Work for World Order Based on International Justice . . . . .	827
President Names U.S. Members of Shrimp Commission . . . . .	842	<b>Protection of Nationals.</b> U.S. Restates Principles Affecting Policy Toward Merchant Marine (Dillon, Meany) . . . . .	834
Temporary Waiver of Some Provisions in U.S.-Iran Trade Agreement . . . . .	843	<b>Publications.</b> Mutual Security Report Emphasizes Problems of Economic Development . . . . .	814
U.S. Restates Principles Affecting Policy Toward Merchant Marine (Dillon, Meany) . . . . .	834	<b>Science.</b> Research Program To Detect, Identify Underground Nuclear Tests Expanded . . . . .	819
Views on Freedom-of-Navigation Amendment to Mutual Security Act (Dillon) . . . . .	832	<b>Treaty Information</b>	
<b>Health, Education, and Welfare.</b> 13th World Health Assembly (delegation) . . . . .	842	Current Actions . . . . .	843
<b>International Organizations and Conferences</b>		Temporary Waiver of Some Provisions in U.S.-Iran Trade Agreement . . . . .	843
Documents on Disarmament Talks Made Available for Reference . . . . .	819	<b>U.S.S.R.</b> United States Plane Downed in Soviet Union (Herter, texts of U.S. statements and note) . . . . .	816
13th World Health Assembly (delegation) . . . . .	842		
<b>Iran</b>		<b>Name Index</b>	
Iranian Archeological Congress Concludes Meeting (Henderson) . . . . .	836	Dillon, Douglas . . . . .	832, 834
Temporary Waiver of Some Provisions in U.S.-Iran Trade Agreement . . . . .	843	Eisenhower, President . . . . .	811, 814, 826, 827, 830, 837, 839
<b>Japan</b>		Henderson, Loy W . . . . .	836
Crown Prince and Princess of Japan To Visit U.S. (Eisenhower) . . . . .	826	Herter, Secretary . . . . .	816, 827, 840
Messages by President and Secretary on Japanese Centennial (Eisenhower, Herter) . . . . .	826	King Mahendra . . . . .	827, 830, 831
		Meany, George . . . . .	835
		Wilcox, Francis O . . . . .	820



the  
Department  
of  
State

UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS  
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID  
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300  
(GPO)

A new release in the *Background* series . . .

## *Republic of the Philippines*

The challenges and achievements of the Republic of the Philippines since its independence in 1946 are discussed in the framework of its economic, social, and political history in a new *Background* pamphlet just published by the Department of State.

The 19-page pamphlet, illustrated with maps and photographs, describes the land and people, government, politics, and economy of the Philippines, and briefly outlines United States-Philippines ties in such areas as mutual defense, trade, and cultural relations.

Publication 6940

20 cents

### *Order Form*

To: Supt. of Documents  
Govt. Printing Office  
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ \_\_\_\_\_  
(cash, check, or money  
order payable to  
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me ..... copies of *Republic of the Philippines*.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Street Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City, Zone, and State: \_\_\_\_\_



